than inaction and reaction; those of us who have supported and will always support "new starts"; those of us who know that America must process into use those natural resources which are its real wealth; and those of us who believe that dollars and credit are only mechanisms to make the economy grow rather than being a cushion upon which to sit call your attention to our "new start"; namely, the Passamaquoddy-St. John Power project, located in the international waters of Canada and the United States. We urgently solicit your wholehearted and active support of our efforts to realize this start and the completion of this project which can be the beginning of the great northeastern power grid, envisioned by that devoted crusader in power development, Leland Olds, who has already contributed in a substantial way to our cause.

In closing, let me say that it was been a real pleasure to have been invited to be with you in your deliberations. I assure you that the programs of your organizations, devoted to the best interests of the electric power consumers of America, always have had and always will have my enthusiastic and complete support. You are doing a great job and you deserve all possible support for the great battles which so obviously lie ahead.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1960

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, in the silence of whose presence the clamor of the outer world dies away, help us to come to this new day, not with hearts clouded by past failures and regrets, but with freshness of mind and with the light of undimmed wonder and of great expectations in our eyes.

All about us are the hard and harsh sounds of discordant voices. Forgive us if we seem to listen too much to those that speak the loudest.

Give us to know that it is the still, small voice that speaks of destiny and of eternal values, not seen or sensed by those who falsely assume that man can live by bread alone. In all our striving, keep our eyes on the verdict of history—that a world built on purely secular levels would be a world that would fester and spoil and corrupt.

Fit us to lead our common humanity, which so largely has lost its way, back to the springs of life and refreshment which alone can restore the souls and bodies of our despairing race. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 19, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

THE ECONOMIC REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 258)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Joint Economic Committee.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 20, 1960.

To the Congress of the United States:

I present herewith my Economic Report, as required by section 3(a) of the Employment Act of 1946.

The report was prepared with the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers and of the heads of the executive departments and independent agencies directly concerned with the matters it discusses. It summarizes the economic developments of the year and the steps taken in major areas of economic policy to promote the sound expansion of employment, production, and income. It also puts forward a program for the year 1960 which, in the context of present and prospective economic conditions, would effectively implement the purposes of the Employment Act.

The major conclusions and recommendations of the report are set forth below, in part in the words of the report itself.

By the first quarter of 1959, the recovery that started early in 1958 had already carried production and income to levels higher than ever before attained in the American economy. A considerable further advance was scored during the remainder of 1959, despite the deep effect of the 116-day strike in the steel industry.

The Nation's output of goods and services in the fourth quarter of 1959 was at an annual rate of $482 billion. When adjusted for price changes, this rate of output was 3½ percent higher than the rate attained in the corresponding period in 1958. By December 1959, total employment had reached a record level, 66.2 million, on a seasonally adjusted basis. And personal income payments in December were at an annual rate of $391 billion, $24 billion greater than a year earlier. After adjustment for increases in prices, the rise in total personal income in 1959 represented a gain of nearly 5 percent in the real buying power of our Nation.

As we look ahead, there are good grounds for confidence that this economic advance can be extended through 1960. Furthermore, with appropriate private actions and public policies, it can carry well beyond the present year.

However, as always in periods of rapid economic expansion, we must avoid speculative excesses and actions that would compress gains into so short a period that the rate of growth could not be sustained. We must seek, through both private actions and public policies, to minimize and contain inflationary pressures that could undermine the basis for a high, continuing rate of growth.

Three elements stand out in the Government's program for realizing the objectives of high production, employment, and income set forth in the Employment Act: first, favorable action by the Congress on the recommendations for appropriations and for measures affecting Federal revenues presented in the budget for the fiscal year 1961; second, use of the resulting surplus, now estimated at $4.2 billion, to retire Federal debt; third, action by the Congress to remove the interest rate limitation that currently inhibits the noninflationary management of the Federal debt. Numerous additional proposals, many of which are described in chapter 4 of the Economic Report, will be made to supplement the Federal Government's existing economic and financial programs.

Following the budget balance now in prospect for the fiscal year 1960, these three elements of the 1960 program will strengthen and be strengthened by the essential contributions to sustainable economic growth made through the policies of the independent Federal Reserve System. Fiscal and monetary policies, which are powerful instruments for preventing the development of inflationary pressures, can effectively reinforce one another.

But these Government policies must be supplemented by appropriate private actions, especially with respect to profits and wages. In our system of free competitive enterprise and shared responsibility, we do not rely on Government alone for the achievement of inflation-free economic growth. On the contrary, that achievement requires a blending of suitable private actions and public policies. Our success in realizing the opportunities that lie ahead will therefore depend in large part upon the ways in which business management, labor leaders, and consumers perform their own economic functions.

A well-informed and vigilant public opinion is essential in our free society for helping achieve the conditions necessary for price stability and vigorous economic growth. Such public opinion can be an effective safeguard against attempts arbitrarily to establish prices or wages at levels that are inconsistent with the general welfare. Informed public opinion is also necessary to support the laws and regulations that provide the framework for the conduct of our economic affairs.

Further progress is needed in establishing a broad public understanding of the relationships of productivity and rewards to costs and prices. It would be a grave mistake to believe that we can successfully substitute legislation or controls for such understanding. Indeed, the complex relationships involved cannot be fixed by law, and attempts to determine them by restrictive governmental action would jeopardize our freedoms and other conditions essential to sound economic growth.

Our system of free institutions and shared responsibility has served us well in achieving economic growth and im-

provement. From our past experience, we are confident that our changing and increasing needs in the future can be met within this flexible system, which gains strength from the incentive it provides for individuals, from the scope it affords for individual initiative and action, and from the assurance it gives that Government remains responsive to the will of the people.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3610) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. FALLON, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. MACK of Washington, and Mr. CRAMER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that the statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND VICE PRESIDENT NIXON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, today marks the seventh anniversary of the inauguration of Dwight D. Eisenhower as President of the United States, and also marks the seventh anniversary of the induction of the distinguished Vice President as the Presiding Officer of this body.

Mr. President, that was a great day in American destiny. I have often said that, in my judgment, there is a quiet, brooding destiny that looks after the affairs of men and nations. I have puzzled hundreds of times about how one could account for the fact that Abraham Lincoln came on the American scene when he did and made his exit when he did, if it were not the unfolding of a divine pattern of history.

I feel that way, too, Mr. President, about the distinguished occupant of the White House, President Dwight D. Eisenhower. First of all, he came at a time when I think a sort of spurious liberalism existed in the country; and when I describe it as "spurious," I mean a degradation of the word "liberal" and its meaning, because, as any student knows, the very word "liberal" is derived from the Latin word "liber," meaning free. So the word "liberalism" pertains to freedom. But the amazing kind of liberalism that was growing in the country at that time was interpreted in terms of deeper intrusion of government and government control.

So, Mr. President, at that period, our distinguished President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and you, sir, came into the national picture and reversed the course, and, I believe, set America on better ground.

Second, I would say that what the country needed at that time was the impress of warm and wholesome personalities. Those came like a tonic to our country 7 years ago today. I feel that thereby the country was deeply enriched and deeply inspired.

Mr. President, our distinguished President, and you, sir, came at a time when solvency was becoming little more than a word in the dictionary; somehow it had lost its meaning and had lost its vitality. But we gave it meaning, because of its importance to the perpetuity of free institutions and the assurance that in solvency America will not go down the disastrous road which, within our generation, has caused the foundering of so many countries.

I think the same can be said about our peace and security. President Eisenhower came at a time when young men of our country were still yielding their blood in the valleys and on the slopes of Korea. But all that has been stopped; and I can think of no greater boast, Mr. President, than that in this 7-year period no young men of America have left their lifeblood on some foreign battlefield. Mr. President, if we had nothing else of which to boast, that fact in itself would be justification for the victory we won, and further justification for the victories I envision ahead.

I believe that President Eisenhower, and you, sir, came at a time when a peculiar and clammy cynicism was beginning to fasten its tentacles upon the thinking and the feeling of America.

I know there are liberals who find rare amusement when one talks about history as being the unfolding of some kind of divine pattern with the dignity of man at its very core. Perhaps they find amusement in it; and if they can, that will be all right with me.

But President Eisenhower, with his big heart, his big soul, and his warm personality, has, in my judgment, driven back the frostline of cynicism in this country, and has developed an entirely wholesome temper.

Mr. President, I must also say that I think you, sir, and the President of the United States came at a time when individual freedom was being impaired. Once it is impaired—whether in the economic field or in the political field—everything else remains nothing more than a hollow shell.

All these are the wholesome things that have come to America in the 7 years since we have assumed the authority and the responsibility of government.

Mr. President, I congratulate you, sir; and I congratulate the President of the United States. I am sure that on this day there will be a feeling of gratitude and thanksgiving in the hearts and minds of the American people for what has been wrought.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I was very much pleased this morning to hear the lovely remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois not only in relation to you, but also in relation to the President of the United States. Some of us who were privileged to be present at the time of the inauguration have not been unmindful of what has happened in the intervening years, as we have seen you meet every experience and every challenge in a wonderful way. We have seen you grow in the confidence of the American people, as is evidenced by the polls, so that there cannot be any question, first, as to your nomination, and, next, as to your election. We are very happy to join with the Senator from Illinois in wishing you Godspeed and happy years for you and your wife ahead.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on construction at military installations (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RESERVE FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of training of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and the progress made in strengthening of the Reserve components, during the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces), reporting, pursuant to law, on the flight pay for that Department, for the 6-month period preceding January 1, 1960; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REASSIGNMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the reassignment of officers designated for aeronautical engineering duty, other than aerologists, to the unrestricted line of the Navy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of that Agency under the Federal Airport Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON FINAL VALUATIONS OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of final valuations of properties of certain carriers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board of Actuaries of the civil service retirement system, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of the Free World Committee, Chicago, Ill., signed by Thomas Hugh Latimer, executive vice president, relating to the assassination of Paul Bang-Jensen; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON DIVISION OF IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the 37th annual convention of the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America and the 5th annual conference of the Young Outdoor Oregonians were held recently in Eugene, Oreg.

The convention adopted a number of resolutions which pertain directly to Federal legislation. These resolutions include recommendations dealing with access to public lands, deer loss in irrigation canals, river development, fish research, and water pollution. All the subjects of the resolutions are of vital concern to citizens of the Northwest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those convention resolutions relating to Federal legislation be printed at this point in the RECORD, for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT 1950 CONVENTION, OREGON DIVISION, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, EUGENE, OREG., NOVEMBER 28, 1959

RESOLUTION 1. DEER TRAP ON IRRIGATION CANAL

Whereas in the Talent division irrigation project in Oregon, of the Reclamation Bureau, there is a delivery canal consisting of about 17½ miles of trapezoid type and vertical walls, which runs across the area used by the Green Springs black-tailed deer herd; and

Whereas said herd is one of the largest migratory black-tailed deer herds in the West, and said canal cuts straight across the migration route of said deer herd; and

Whereas ramps and slab crossings have been provided at certain places along said canal, but the same generally are ineffective to provide a means of escape for the deer that get into said canal, and such would be true regardless of the number of said ramps and slab crossings provided; and

Whereas a known minimum of 75 deer have been trapped in a 19-mile section of open concrete ditch between Howard Prairie Reservoir and Keene Creek Reservoir during the first month of operation of the project; and

Whereas it is impossible for any fawn to escape from said canal after getting into it; and

Whereas the deer losses caused by said canal will decimate said herd if corrective measures are not taken; and

Whereas a slab covering of said canal or a deer-proof fence with bridges at proper places would eliminate said losses and also any loss of human life and domestic animals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 28th day of November 1959, That the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation immediately construct improvements that will prevent the loss of human and animal life in Talent project ditches, and until such time as these structures are completed, to drain the ditches or operate the same at levels which will allow animals to escape.

RESOLUTION 2. ROGUE RIVER BASIN STUDY

Whereas the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America is in favor of a dam on the main stem of the Rogue River at the Lost Creek site or above, provided it is constructed and operated so as to be beneficial to anadromous fish resources, wildlife, and recreation as well as flood control; and

Whereas the most important flood control project is a dam at Lost Creek site and the same is unacceptable to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under the proposed operating plan, because of possible damaging effects to the fishery that might result in total loss of the fish runs which have a substantial value to the State of Oregon; and

Whereas an Army Engineers' representative states that they have "substantially completed studies for a plan of development" of the basin but have no funds available for an expanded study to include provisions for possibe fishery benefits on Rogue River; and

Whereas a representative of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service states that water temperratures of the lower Rogue River already are critical and that it is possible that the present plan for Lost Creek Dam would further aggravate the problem and that their service is now making a complete temperature study of Rogue River to determine optimum flow and temperature necessary to enhance anadromous fish life in the Rogue; and

Whereas the present study of the Rogue River is incomplete in that it does not take the needs of anadromous fish resources into full account; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America, assembled in convention at Eugene, Oreg., this 28th day of November 1959, That the Congress of the United States be requested to provide more time and funds for further study of the Rogue River and tributaries by the Army Engineers, so as to secure an acceptable project on the main stem of the Rogue River at Lost Creek or above that would benefit the anadromous fish resources, wildlife, and recreation; and be it further

Resolved, That until positive assurance can be provided that these benefits will be an integral part of such project the Oregon division stands unalterably opposed to any structure as located and outlined above; and be it further

Resolved, That the congressional delegation from Oregon be urged to work toward this end.

RESOLUTION 5. PUBLIC LAND ACCESS

Whereas the increasing public demand for outdoor recreation is resulting in crowding of available recreational areas and straining the tolerance of some private landowners; and

Whereas the recreational potentials of the 32 million acres of Federal land in Oregon are not being fully utilized for want of an adequate public access to those lands; and

Whereas rights-of-way and access roads are necessary for the proper management and utilization of Federal lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League urges the U.S. Congress to appropriate funds for the development of an adequate public road system to serve all major blocks of Federal land in Oregon.

RESOLUTION 6. PUBLIC LAND ADMINISTRATION

Whereas the public lands and resources administered by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management require greater protection and more intensive development than that Bureau has been equipped to provide; and

Whereas support of the Izaak Walton League for a more aggressive land management program has produced some constructive results during 1959: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League continues to urge the Department of the Interior and the U.S. Congress to strengthen the regulatory authority of the U.S. Bureau of Land Management and provide the appropriations necessary for multiple-use development and management of lands and resources administered by that agency.

The Oregon division further renews confidence in the principles set forth in the public lands resolution adopted in March 1959 and subsequently adopted by the National Izaak Walton League of America.

RESOLUTION 7. FISH RESEARCH

Whereas the anadromous salmon and steelhead trout of the Columbia River are of great economic and esthetic value as sport and commercial fish; and

Whereas the continued production of these fish, particularly the long-run races, is dependent upon the maintenance of natural spawning grounds in the watershed and of migration routes to them; and

Whereas Columbia basin development plans contain proposals for high dams across these migration routes below the few remaining spawning grounds; and

Whereas acquisition of knowledge and skills necessary to provide and maintain

adequate passages past such structures has not kept pace with the planning and design of the dams; and

Whereas research is necessary to obtain this knowledge, vital to maintenance of this renewable natural resource; and

Whereas this Columbia River salmon and steelhead resource is of national significance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Izaak Walton League of America, That the the U.S. Government make $1 million per year available for research into ways and means of maintaining anadromous fish in the face of the major structures proposed for construction below their spawning grounds.

RESOLUTION 8. PROPOSED RESOLUTION FOR WATERSHED MANAGEMENT RESEARCH IN OREGON

Whereas our national progress and economic security are vitally dependent upon adequate supplies of usable water; and

Whereas wise use of water-source areas is dependent upon principles of water shed management involving integration of water production with recreational uses, growing and harvesting of timber, and grazing of domestic stock and game animals; and

Whereas deteriorating watershed conditions in the State of Oregon have led to many forms of damage to economic and esthetic values, including flooding, sedimentation of stream channels, and destruction of fish habitat; and

Whereas techniques of sound watershed management have not been developed because of insufficient research, particularly in the Pacific Northwest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League—

(a) Promote an expanded program of research on forest and range watershed lands.

(b) Advise members of Oregon's congressional delegation of the need for these investigations and encourage support of increased funds for upstream watershed research by the Forest Service in Oregon; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies of the House Committee on Appropriations, and to Members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

RESOLUTION 10. DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESCHUTES RIVER

Whereas the Deschutes River now is one of the outstanding fishing streams of the United States and is noted for its recreational offerings; and

Whereas the stream provides water for irrigation and hydro power; and

Whereas there is an increased demand on its water for all uses; and

Whereas in the past its development has been on a fragmentary, bit by bit, often single use, basis without any plan that gives consideration to all beneficial uses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America, assembled in Eugene, Oreg., this 28th day of November, 1959:

(a) Requests the Forest Service to make a study and adopt a program of use of its lands contiguous to the Deschutes River and its tributaries, giving consideration to the multiple use concept, taking into consideration the needs of the people of Oregon and of the United States for outdoor recreation.

(b) Requests the Bureau of Land Management to make a like study.

(c) Requests the committee on natural resources to develop a plan of recreation use and development for the entire Deschutes River Basin, which will coordinate the plans of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, the State lands including State parks, and private lands, and hydroelectric developments.

(d) Requests the Portland General Electric Co., which public utility now operates a hydro project on the Deschutes River known as Pelton, which company desires to build another dam immediately upstream from Pelton, where it has indicated that it will provide substantial recreational opportunities as well as replace the Cove State Park, which Round Butte would inundate, to contribute the sum of $25,000 or more if necessary to the State of Oregon to be used under the direction of the committee on natural resources to hire a recognized, trained, experienced recreationist to act as director for the committee in developing a coordinated recreational plan for the Deschutes River Basin.

(e) Requests the Oregon Water Resources Board to accelerate their announced intention of making a study of the Deschutes River and to adopt a program for the use and control of the Deschutes River Basin, which will give consideration to all beneficial uses including the use of the water for recreation, fish, and wildlife as well as for irrigation, hydro power, pollution abatement, domestic, municipal, and industrial uses.

(f) Request the Fish and Game Commission to develop a plan that would provide the least possible damage to anadromous fish runs and to other game fish in the event the Federal Power Commission should license the construction of Round Butte or any other dam on the Deschutes River and that such plan be presented to Federal Power Commission to be made a part of the license.

(g) Request the State of Oregon to intervene in the application of Portland General Electric Co. to the Federal Power Commission to urge that body to conform to the program for use and control of the Deschutes River as may be adopted by the Oregon Water Resources Board and in the event that the program permits the use of the water in the Round Butte section, that the license, should one be issued by the Federal Power Commission, adopt the plan for fish adopted by Oregon Fish and Game Commissions, and include a recognition of the recreation plan for the use of the river basin to be developed by the State of Oregon through its committee on natural resources and the recreational and land use plans to be developed by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

(h) The Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America reiterates its historic stand against the licensing of any single purpose dams or obstructions of any kind in the Deschutes River until the conditions outlined herein are met. It is the firm conviction of this organization that the best use of this river is for fishing and recreation and uses compatible therewith and that this river should not have been and should not be further committed to hydropower uses.

RESOLUTION 11. PUBLIC LANDS EXCHANGE

Whereas problems of access to public lands are in many instances aggravated by the existence of isolated public land parcels that are entirely or largely surrounded by private lands; and

Whereas comprehensive study has been given to this problem by organizations and agencies concerned; and

Whereas several solutions have been proposed to ease the problems created by the so-called isolated public land parcels, said solutions including, reblocking, through the system of land exchange, condemnations and purchase of easements, and exchange of use; and

Whereas the system of exchange of use, providing the tenancy be on a stable basis comparable to 10-year Bureau of Land Management leases, appears to be the most feasible and expeditious: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America go on record in favor of the concept, under proper controls, when applicable to the exchange of use idea.

RESOLUTION 13. AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT, THE BLATNIK BILL, H.R. 3610

Whereas the Izaak Walton League of America has already gone on record in support of this bill; and

Whereas action on this bill was not completed at the last session of Congress; and

Whereas Congressman BLATNIK, of Minnesota, is to be highly commended for his inspired leadership and zeal in support of this legislation; and

Whereas Governor Hatfield has gone on record in support of this bill based on the excellent record of the program of Federal grants to municipalities for sewage works in Oregon, particularly, and for the critical need to continue this activity: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., November 28, 1959, That action be taken by the Oregon division and by the national to support the Blatnik bill, H.R. 3610, which calls for amendment to the Federal Pollution Control Act, the primary purpose of which is to increase the amount of grants to municipalities to further encourage them to construct sewage treatment works.

RESOLUTION 14. FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT, PUBLIC LAW 660, EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF SECTION 5, GRANTS TO STATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCIES

Whereas this provision authorizes $3 million each year as grants on a matching basis to the State water pollution control agencies to support their technical investigations, enforcement, education, and other activities; and

Whereas these funds have proved to be an incentive to the development and improvement of water pollution control activities in the States; and

Whereas the provisions of this section of the act are due to expire June 30, 1961; and

Whereas cessation of these grants would result in serious impairment of State water pollution control programs and of Federal-State cooperative activities in water pollution control enforcement actions: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., November 28, 1959, That action be taken by the Oregon division and by the national in support of the Federal Pollution Control Act, Public Law 660, section 5, providing for extending the authorization of $3 million each year as grants on a matching basis to State water pollution control agencies so as to enable these States to continue at an accelerated rate, their technical investigations. enforcement, actions, education, and other activities in the control of water pollution.

RESOLUTION 15. NEED FOR EXPANDED RESEARCH PROGRAM IN WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Whereas major technical breakthroughs to provide better methods of treating industrial and municipal waste are urgently needed if the quality of our water resources is to be maintained for legitimate uses including public health and fish and aquatic life; and

Whereas the speed and accuracy with which we solve these problems depend solely upon new knowledge from research; and

Whereas Public Law 660, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, provides under section 4 for the Public Health Service to conduct research through the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati, through grants-in-aid to public and private agencies, through contract research, and through consulting service of experts, and research fellowships; and

Whereas despite these various research efforts the need for new knowledge is still noticeably outstripping the acquisition of such knowledge: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., November 28, 1959, That action be taken by the Oregon division and by the national to call for increased appropriations for the Public Health Service to implement section 4 of Public Law 660. This will provide for expansion of research not only by that service directly through the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, but will also make possible expansion of research facilities at educational institutions and other organizations. Rapid expansion of research in this critical field of water pollution control is urgently needed to keep abreast of our rapidly growing population and industry and changing patterns of water use.

RESOLUTION 16. PROVISION OF LOW FLOW AUGMENTATION IN FEDERAL WATER RESOURCE CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

Whereas important advances have been made in water resources policy in recent years as a result of congressional action; and

Whereas an important addition, which would supplement and make more valuable these advances as well as give support to the water resource development programs of the States and the Federal Government, would be the ability to use Federal water development projects to increase the flow in streams, particularly during periods of low flow; and

Whereas adding this as an authorized function in Federal projects would make it possible to develop the full potential of reservoir sites, and bring about a general improvement in the quality of waters under regulation; and

Whereas this addition is particularly important to fish and wildlife and other aquatic life, to municipal and industrial water supplies, the protection of public health, and the recreational use of waters; and

Whereas the benefits from low flow augmentation are general, widespread, and nonspecific; and

Whereas the Fish and Wildlife Service Coordination Act of 1946, amended in 1958, authorizes the Fish and Wildlife Service to undertake similar responsibilities with respect to fish and wildlife; and

Whereas the resolution suggested herein should supplement the Fish and Wildlife Service program by considering all other aspects benefited by flow augmentation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America is convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., November 28, 1959, That action be taken by the Oregon division and by the national to support legislation:

(a) Granting general authority to the Federal water resource construction agencies to include the provision of low flow augmentation as an authorized function in planning future water development projects, in modification of existing projects, or in adjustment of operations of existing projects in order to achieve the described benefits.

(b) Granting authority noted in (a) above as a nonreimbursable item in Federal water resource development projects;

(c) Granting the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through the Public Health Service authorization to cooperate with the Federal water resource construction agencies in the development of low flow augmentation programs since the net effect of these programs is to control and improve water quality; and further that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be required to submit reports to the Congress to accompany Federal construction agency reports insofar as low flow augmentation programs are concerned;

(d) With the proviso that the above provisions be recommended only with the understanding that flow augmentation is not to be used for the abatement of water pollution in lieu of full and complete sewage and waste treatment facilities by city, industry, or others concerned.

RESOLUTION OF LODGE 459, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution in support of the Forand bill (H.R. 4700) as adopted by Lodge 459 of the International Association of Machinists in St. Paul, Minn., be inserted at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That the members of Lodge No. 459, International Association of Machinists, representing 2,600 members, wholeheartedly support H.R. 4700, as sponsored by Representative FORAND; be it further

Resolved, That the elected Congressmen do all in the scope of their office in supporting this enabling legislation, whereby the retired Americans may have a burden lifted from their shoulders.

RESOLUTION OF INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE AND SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America in support of the proposal for a White Fleet of mercy ships (S. Con. Res. 66) be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 4. MERCY FLEET

In July of 1959, Congressmen EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, and BATES, of Massachusetts, introduced into the House of Representatives, and Senators HUMPHREY and AIKEN introduced into the Senate, a concurrent resolution calling for the establishment of a Great White Fleet of mercy ships to carry American surplus food, medical aid and supplies, to disaster and distressed areas throughout the world.

This particular resolution was in response to suggestion by Oklahoma naval officer, Comdr. Frank A. Manson.

Since the time of the introduction of the concurrent resolution, Life magazine, in its July 27 issue, threw its full support behind the idea of a Great White Fleet as a "bold proposal for peace." Massive mail was received by the Congress urging establishment of this Fleet by every sponsor of the concurrent resolution from every State in the Union including Hawaii and Alaska. Less than 1 percent of the mail received was unfavorable to the proposal.

Over 20 percent of the House of Representatives and over one-third of the Senate are cosponsoring the resolution.

This bright concept for peace, it is true, will not bring peace to the world in a single sweeping movement. However, it can prevent the people of the world from losing hope. A Great White Fleet would come from our reserve fleet, crews would come from the Navy and the merchant marine, and the supplies from America's great abundant surplus.

It should be remembered that in 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt sent a similar Great White Fleet around the world, which had the mission of impressing American naval power upon the world. The present Great White Fleet would carry hope and health to areas of the world struck with poverty, disease, or starvation. They would carry supplies and equipment necessary to bring relief to people of all nations in times of emergency or disaster.

We are known as a people and as a nation for the fact that the helping hand of America is always extended to disaster areas. This Great White Fleet can quickly become an international symbol of American concern for the destitute everywhere.

Commander Manson's idea of using our reserve fleet for the purpose of waging an aggressive peace program; of bringing relief to disaster victims; of carrying emergency supplies and medical facilities into famine-stricken areas; and in general, of bringing the arts of healing into underdeveloped regions wherever emergency needs exist, is one of the most meritorious proposals for people-to-people effort of putting our ideals into action.

There can be no question of our ability to do this. We have the ships, we have the doctors, the money, and the commodities. The cost of putting the first six-unit fleet into operation and maintaining it for 18 months has been estimated at $30 million. This is but a small fraction of the amount we now spend for any one of a dozen luxuries. Certainly it represents only an infinitesimal amount when compared with the annual expenditure of the Nation's military armaments.

We now have over $6 billion worth of dairy products, cotton, and various staples and items of food piled up in our surplus-commodity warehouses.

The President already has the authority under existing law to divert shiploads of these commodities to areas where emergency relief is needed, regardless of the friendliness of the governments involved. Here, in the idea of the new White Fleet, is a magnificent opportunity to implement the American dream which was also the dream of the ancient prophets—of turning our swords into plowshares. What an immense appeal this program would have in the eyes of the uncommitted peoples around the world.

Certainly the world needs our help. Just as certainly, we need to give that help. Selfishness impoverishes those who practice it. Undisciplined self-indulgence degrades us as individuals and as people. Even if there were an impenetrable curtain drawn around us so that the rest of the world could not witness our prosperity, we would be poorer in not sharing. In holding on to our valuable commodities, we are just guarding these commodities from being used by other people. We are at the same time excluding ourselves from the valuable and necessary fellowship of the rest of the world. The world cannot indefinitely survive with the preponderant majority in poverty and the fortunate few enjoying prosperity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the sixth national policy conference of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, AFL–CIO, go on record as supporting the institution of the mercy mission of the Great White Fleet, by reactivation of part of the mothball fleet to wage an aggressive peace program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent the Senators and Congressmen who introduced the concurrent resolution on the Great White Fleet.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 1 of the hearings on an inquiry into the satellite and missile programs;

S. Res. 207. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Official Reporters of the Senate;

S. Res. 211. Resolution to pay certain funeral expenses of the late Senator Langer, of North Dakota;

S. Res. 227. Resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to development in military technology and foreign policy in Africa;

S. Res. 228. Resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to foreign policy on Asia and Western Europe; and

S. Res. 229. Resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to foreign policy.

FUNDS FOR STUDY OF INTER-AGENCY COORDINATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, I report an original resolution, which was approved by the Committee at its meeting on Monday, January 18, 1960. The resolution is for the purpose of authorizing funds for a study of interagency coordination, including completion of a study previously authorized by the Senate.

The committee proposes a review of problems of budgeting and accounting, efficiency and economy in certain significant activities shared by several Federal agencies in related fields. This type of review is, of course, especially appropriate to the standing jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations as designated under the Legislative Reorganization Law and the Rules of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 255) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Whereas pursuant to Senate Resolution 347, Eighty-fifth Congress and Senate Resolution 42, Eighty-sixth Congress, the Committee on Government Operations has been conducting a "complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the international activities of Federal executive branch departments and agencies relative to worldwide health matters"; and

Whereas the study indicates significant problems of coordination between (a) numerous agencies of the United States Government engaged in health activities, (b) agencies of the United States Government and international organizations of which the United States is a member, (c) official programs of the United States Government and related nonofficial programs of private voluntary organizations, in addition to problems of Federal budgeting and accounting; and

Whereas the study confirms the continued existence of certain problems of the interagency organization of common Federal activities such as documentation and other problem areas of management of the general type revealed in past studies by the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of Government; and

Whereas pursuant to rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations has the duty of studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency, and the further duty of studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to—

(a) complete its study of worldwide health research, assistance, and rehabilitation matters;

(b) to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters in scientific and other fields where there may be indications of a need for (a) improved budgeting, accounting, and other managerial practices on the part of agencies of the United States Government, (b) strengthened cooperation and coordination among Federal agencies;

(c) effectiveness of international organizations of which the United States is a member; and

(d) avoidance of Federal duplication of private responsibilities and activities.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from date of approval to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $85,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT ENTITLED "ADMINISTRATION OF U.S. FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS IN BOLIVIA" (S. REPT. NO. 1030)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 43, 86th Congress, 1st session, I submit a report of its permanent Subcommittee on Investigations regarding the administration of the U.S. foreign aid program in Bolivia, which I ask may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, in connection with this report, a press release which I have issued.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS,
U.S. SENATE.

Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, stated:

"Executive hearings were held by the Senate permanent Subcommittee on Investigations to evaluate the administration by the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) and its predecessors, of U.S. foreign aid programs in Bolivia since 1953, totaling an expenditure of $137 million.

"These hearings disclosed that, as a result of loose administration, an inadequate U.S. mission staff, difficulties in recruitment of personnel, and a dearth of administrative ability among Bolivian officials, heavy losses, in the neighborhood of several million dollars, were sustained in connection with the U.S. aid programs in Bolivia. For example, almost $2 million in food and fiber items were lost in the ports and in transit from 1954 to 1957. Many claims for such losses against insurance companies are statute barred, as they were not initiated within the prescribed period of time.

"Many projects were undertaken in that country without benefit of sufficient prior review by qualified technical personnel and, as a result, several projects were discontinued, some of which were beyond the absorptive capacity of Bolivia. The Villamontes irrigation project, which has been permanently halted, is unoperational and cost us over a million dollars. The Muyurina project, for vocational agricultural training, which cost us over $100,000, did not achieve its purpose and attempts are being made to use it for other purposes. The Cochabamba milk processing plant, which cost us $100,000, will never operate efficiently. Two yucca flour mills, financed by the U.S. Government at a cost of $225,000, will never be used.

"The agriculture servicio (a joint United States and Bolivian administrative and cooperative mechanism) failed to maintain adequate records until 1957 and, as a result, over a million dollars' worth of equipment cannot be accounted for. In addition, it imported machinery that was not needed and machinery that was not adaptable for use in that country. As a result, over a million dollars' worth of this excess machinery has already been sold at a loss. Attempts are now being made to dispose of $500,000 more and it is anticipated there will be losses on this amount.

"From 1954 to 1957, despite existing regulations, the Government failed to collect counterpart money from the Bolivian Government. There are still nearly $2 million owed, and some 18 distributors have become enriched while projects which needed this financing were impaired. It was quite apparent during the hearings that the former mission director in Bolivia from 1952 to March 1956 was unaware of the various shortcomings which were brought to light, although he should have been.

"Although one of the ICA mechanisms for ascertaining whether various aspects of a program are being operated efficiently is the end-use audit system, it was not until April of 1957 that end-use reports began in Bolivia. Since that time approximately 150 reports have been submitted, revealing many inadequacies which existed since 1953. Fortunately, during the past year, there has been

a capable director in Bolivia who is taking positive action to correct many of the irregularities which formerly existed."

REPORT ENTITLED "CASE PROBLEMS IN GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT" (S. REPT. NO. 1031)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], from the Select Committee on Small Business, I submit a report entitled "Case Problems in Government Procurement." I ask that the report, which includes a statement by the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 2861. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to negotiate a new contract with the city of Sturgis, S. Dak., with respect to the use of the sewage facilities of such city by the Fort Meade Veterans' Hospital, Sturgis, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 2862. A bill to provide a national food and fiber utilization policy; to provide for greater conservation of natural resources; to provide farmers a greater voice in the formulation and administration of farm programs; to provide for supply adjustment programs so as to return to farmers a fair share of the national income; to provide greater opportunity for economic development in rural agricultural areas; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. SYMINGTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 2863. A bill for the relief of Kyong-Ok Ahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2864. A bill to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; and

S. 2865. A bill to provide grants for adult education for migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2866. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to relax the severity of existing provisions with respect to deductions from benefits on account of earnings; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2867. A bill to give effect to the Convention between the United States of America and Cuba for the Conservation of Shrimp, signed at Habana, August 15, 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HART, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 2868. A bill to protect the right to vote in national elections by making unlawful the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting in such elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. FONG, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 2869. A bill to restore the size and weight limitations on fourth-class matter mailed to or from Alaska and Hawaii which existed prior to their admission as States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Hawaii when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2870. A bill for the relief of Alfred O. Domeier, and Frances I. Domeier; and

S. 2871. A bill for the relief of Dr. Daryoush K. Shahrokh; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 2872. A bill for the relief of Ennis Craft McLaren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

FUNDS FOR STUDY OF INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 255) authorizing funds for a study of interagency coordination, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HUMPHREY, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees".)

NATIONAL FOOD AND FIBER UTILIZATION POLICY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a farm bill to: First, provide a national food and fiber utilization policy; second, provide for greater conservation of natural resources; third, provide farmers a greater voice in the formulation and administration of farm programs; fourth, provide for supply adjustment programs so as to return to farmers a fair share of the national income; and fifth, provide greater opportunity for economic development in rural agricultural areas; and for other purposes.

Since Congress adjourned last September, the economic conditions in agriculture have deteriorated to a point where immediate positive action is essential.

Farm prices, already at very low levels last summer, have dropped even further. In December, the farm parity ratio was 77—lowest for any December since the depression year of 1933. In 1959, farm income declined 15 percent.

According to the Department of Agriculture's own estimates, this year it is expected to drop another 7 to 8 percent.

In 1959, production of all farm commodities set a new record. That production was 5 to 10 percent above the total we as a nation use at home, and export for sale or assistance abroad.

Today the Government inventory of surplus farm commodities is over $9 billion—and during this year, that figure will increase.

These facts demonstrate the degree of the failure of the present farm program. Overproduction has built up huge surpluses. But these surpluses have not been used to any real advantage, either at home or abroad. In addition, there have been reduced farm prices, and reduced farm income.

Nevertheless, the expenditure on the agriculture program over the last 5 years has exceeded $30 billion.

Despite these conditions, has there been any change of policy on the part of this administration? There has not. Therefore, it is essential that the Congress act—and act now.

To this end, in the hope of getting action in time to affect the 1960 crops, I am introducing a bill designed to deal with this problem; and I would respectfully request that this bill become the basis for corrective legislation early in this session of the Congress.

The bill would:

First. Establish a "food use policy," whereby existing surpluses and future production will provide more of our citizens with an adequate and nutritious diet; and will promote world peace by helping to alleviate hunger and poverty in undeveloped nations.

Second. Place the administration of such domestic and foreign food use programs in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the State Department, where the responsibility, the personnel, and the administrative machinery exist.

Third. Establish a national reserve stockpile of food items to be used in event of enemy attack, or other national disaster. This reserve stockpile would be administered by the Office of Civilian and Defense Mobilization.

Fourth. Halt the costly and uneconomical buildup of surplus commodities by bringing farm production into balance with our national food and fiber needs.

Fifth. Establish farmer advisory and administration committees composed of bona fide farmers, so as to have more practical farm programs.

Sixth. Provide the authority and the flexibility to the end that the Secretary of Agriculture may tailor individual commodity programs to the particular conditions or requirements affecting that commodity.

Seventh. Provide that a two-thirds majority of producers voting in a national referendum must approve any supply adjustment program before it becomes effective. Prior to voting in a referendum, all producers are to be provided with a thorough explanation of the provisions and effects of any program.

Eighth. Require the preparation of a true parity price formula, a formula which would afford fair returns to the family farmer for his labor, investment, and managerial ability. Prior to adoption of such formula, price goals are established at 90 percent of the present parity formula.

Ninth. Place a limit on any benefits which might be received by producers who are not bona fide farmers.

Tenth. Provide for a natural resource conservation program, whereby a producer, to be eligible for benefits, must contribute a portion of his crop land to sound conservation practices. The Department of Agriculture may rent additional acres for conservation or reforestation purposes.

Eleventh. Continue the program whereby the farmer and the Department of Agriculture share the cost of establishing needed conservation practices.

Twelfth. Establish an agency—the Agriculture Development Service—in the Department of Agriculture whose sole function would be to develop and coordinate programs to deal with low income problems in rural areas.

The provisions of this bill will enable our farm population to obtain a more reasonable share of our Nation's prosperity and insure an adequate supply of food for our total national needs, and these objectives would be accomplished at a greatly reduced cost to the American taxpayer.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2862) to provide a national food and fiber utilization policy; to provide for greater conservation of natural resources; to provide farmers a greater voice in the formulation and administration of farm programs; to provide for supply adjustment programs so as to return to farmers a fair share of the national income; to provide greater opportunity for economic development in rural agricultural areas; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I. FARMER COMMITTEES

SEC. 101. In order to insure a more practical and workable domestic farm program and to insure more direct participation by family farm operators in the formulation and administration of agricultural policy, the Secretary shall, in carrying out the provisions of this Act, utilize the services of local and county farmer committees and State Farmer Administrative Committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and also the State Farmer Advisory Committees and the National Farmer Advisory Committee established pursuant to the provisions of this title.

SEC. 102. (a) In each State there shall be a State Farmer Advisory Committee for the State composed of twelve members. Such members shall be elected by the County Farmer Committees of the State concerned from nominees made by such committees. Members of the State Advisory Committees shall be elected for two years, except that with respect to the membership of each committee first elected pursuant to this subsection one-half of such membership shall be elected to serve for a period of only one year. Each State Farmer Advisory Committee shall be utilized by the Secretary to study and consider the agricultural problems and policies of the State it represents and shall cooperate with and advise the Secretary, the National Farmer Advisory Committee, and the County Farmer Committees of the State it represents regarding such problems and policies.

(b) There is hereby established a committee to be known as the National Farmer Advisory Committee. The membership of such committee shall be appointed by the President. Insofar as practicable, members shall be appointed to insure fair representation of all agricultural commodities and geographical areas of the United States. Not less than one-half of the membership of such committee shall be from the membership of the several State Farmer Advisory Committees. The membership of such committee shall also include representatives of National, State, or commodity organizations of agricultural producers; farm cooperatives; agricultural education or research institutions; and industries engaged in the processing, transporting, and marketing of agricultural commodities. Such committee shall be utilized by the Secretary to advise and make recommendations to him with respect to all matters pertaining to agriculture.

(c) Except as provided in subsection (b), only persons who are agricultural producers and who obtain the major portion of their income from farming shall be eligible for selection and service on committees established under this title.

(d) The Secretary is authorized and directed to issue such rules and regulations as he deems proper with respect to the nomination and election of the State Farmer Advisory Committees.

(e) Members of the State Farmer Advisory Committees and the National Farmer Advisory Committee shall receive compensation, at a rate to be determined by the Secretary, for the performance of the duties of the committees, and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of the duties vested in the committees.

SEC. 103. The fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth sentences of section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act are amended to read as follows: "The local and county committees provided for in this subsection shall be known as Local Farmer Committees and County Farmer Committee, respectively. In each State there shall be a State Farmer Administrative Committee composed of three members. Such members shall be appointed by the Secretary from nominees designated by County Farmer Committees of the State. Such members shall be appointed for a period not to exceed three years. Only persons who are agricultural producers and who obtain the major portion of their income from farming shall be eligible for selection and service on committees provided for under this subsection."

TITLE II. NATIONAL FOOD USE PROGRAM

SEC. 201. It is hereby declared to be in the interest of national security and the maintenance of the health and morale of the American people that the means for obtaining an adequate and nutritious diet be placed so far as practicable within the reach of every person in the Nation. It is further declared to be in the interest of national security that there be maintained a national reserve stockpile of essential food, fiber, and biological oils for use by the civilian population in the event of enemy attack or other disaster. It is further declared to be in the interest of national security that the abundant supplies of food, fiber, and biological oils available in the United States be used so as to alleviate hunger throughout the world, to promote world peace by assisting more rapid economic development of undeveloped nations, and to further the interests of the United States abroad and to fulfill commitments under international agreements.

SEC. 202. (a) In order to carry out the policy expressed in the first sentence of section 201 of this title, the administration of (1) the National School Lunch Act, (2) the Act of July 1, 1958 (72 Stat. 276), providing for the continuation of the special milk program for children, and (3) section 306 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, providing for the establishment of a food stamp plan, is hereby transferred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and all functions and activities carried out thereunder shall be carried out by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and all references in such provisions to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be deemed to refer to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make a determination each year of the total quantity of each agricultural commodity that will be required in the next succeeding year in the operation of the programs named in subsection (a) of this section and any other similar programs carried out under his jurisdiction. Such total quantity for any commodity shall consist of (1) the quantity of such commodity he determines will be required from the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture, and (2) the quantity of such commodity he determines will be removed from the open market.

(c) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall certify each year to the Secretary of Agriculture the total quantities of each agricultural commodity determined by him pursuant to subsections (b) (1) and (2) to be required for such year to carry out the programs described in subsection (a) and other similar programs carried out under his jurisdiction.

(d) The Secretary of Agriculture shall be responsible for the delivery, from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation or from acquisitions made by the Department of Agriculture, at the location and time and in the form specified by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the quantity of commodities determined pursuant to subsection (b)(1) to be required in carrying out the programs described in subsection (a) of this section and other similar programs carried out under his jurisdiction.

(e) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be responsible for ascertaining prior to certification that sufficient funds are available to remove from the open market the quantity of each commodity determined by him pursuant to subsection (b) (2) of this section.

SEC. 203. (a) The Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization (hereinafter referred to as the "Director") is authorized and directed to establish and maintain a national reserve stockpile of essential food, fiber, and biological oils for use by the civilian population of the United States, its possessions, and the District of Columbia in the event of enemy attack or other disaster.

(b) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Director shall make a determination each year of the quantity of each agricultural commodity that will be required for maintaining the stockpile provided for in subsection (a).

(c) The Director shall certify each year to the Secretary of Agriculture the total quantity of each agricultural commodity determined by him pursuant to subsection (b) to be required for such year for maintaining the stockpile provided for in subsection (a).

(d) The Secretary of Agriculture shall be responsible for the delivery, from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation or from acquisitions made by the Department of Agriculture, at the location and time and in the form specified by the Director, the quantity of commodities certified under subsection (c) for carrying out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary of State shall make a determination each year of the total quantity of each agricultural commodity that will be required in carrying out authorized programs (including programs under titles I and II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954) furthering the interests of the United States abroad and for fulfilling commitments under international agreements. Such total quantity for any commodity shall consist of (1) the quantity of such commodity he determines will be required from the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture, and (2) the quantity of such commodity he determines will be removed from the open market.

(b) The Secretary of State shall certify each year to the Secretary of Agriculture the total quantities of each agricultural commodity determined by him pursuant to subsection (a) to be required for such year to carry out the programs specified in such subsection.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture shall be responsible for the delivery, from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation or from acquisitions made by the Department of Agriculture, at the location and time and in the form specified by the Secretary of State, the quantity of commodities determined by him pursuant to subsection (a)(1) of this section to be required in carrying out the programs specified in subsection (a) of this section.

(d) The Secretary of State shall be responsible for ascertaining prior to certification that sufficient funds are available to remove from the open market the quantity of each commodity determined by him pursuant to subsection (a)(2) of this section.

SEC. 205. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and the Secretary of State shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture for commodities delivered pursuant to sections 202(d), 203(d), and 204(c).

TITLE III. FARM PARITY

SEC. 301. The Secretary shall determine the parity price of any agricultural commodity in accordance with section 301(a)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

SEC. 302. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall maintain the average price during the marketing year for any commodity at not less than 90 per centum of the parity price for such commodity, if producers have not disapproved a market supply adjustment program for such marketing year in a referendum conducted in accordance with the provisions of title IV.

SEC. 303. (a) As soon as practicable after enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall undertake research and studies necessary to determine a true parity price formula for each agricultural commodity which will enable the efficient family farm operator producing such commodity to earn and receive a return on his labor and investment reasonably comparable to that received by similar productive resources in other segments of the economy.

(b) The Secretary shall report the results of such research and studies to the Congress not later than December 31, 1960.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to make such expenditures as he deems necessary in carrying out the provisions of this section.

TITLE IV. MARKET SUPPLY ADJUSTMENT

SEC. 401. If at any time for any commodity or group of closely related commodities (such as feed grains), the Secretary determines that in the absence of a market supply adjustment program for such commodity or group of commodities, such prices would, for the next succeeding marketing year, average less than the price specified in section 302, he shall, after utilizing the advice and recommendations of the National Farmer Advisory Committee, formulate and announce a market supply adjustment program to be effective for such marketing year, which will be adapted to the special circumstances and conditions of such commodity or group of commodities, and which will maintain returns to producers at the levels sepcified in section 302 at a cost to the United States no greater than the limitation specified in section 409.

SEC. 402. (a) The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after the formulation and announcement of any market supply adjustment program made pursuant to section 401, conduct a referendum, by secret ballot, of farmers engaged in the production for commercial use of the commodity concerned to determine whether such farmers are in favor of or opposed to the announced program.

(b) If more than one-third of the farmers voting in such referendum oppose such market supply adjustment program, it shall not become effective. The Secretary shall proclaim the results of any referendum held hereunder as soon as possible.

SEC. 403. In formulating and carrying out a market supply adjustment program for any commodity or group of commodities, the Secretary shall, with the advice and recommendations of the National Farmer Advisory Committee, use such means as he deems the most efficient and economical to insure that producers will receive not less than the price specified in section 302 for their commodity during the operation of such program. Such means may include, but shall not be limited to: commodity loans, marketing agreements and orders, acreage allotments, marketing quotas, market shipment scheduling, commodity purchase and diversion programs, stabilization pools, incentive payments, compensatory payments, market stratification, and export equalization payments. Whenever payments of any type are utilized in the program for any commodity, the Secretary shall give producers and exporters the option of receiving payments in kind or cash.

SEC. 404. The Secretary shall, at least one month prior to the date of any referendum conducted pursuant to section 402, provide each producer who is eligible to vote with a thorough explanation of the provisions of the program submitted to referendum. Such explanation shall include, but not be limited to, information and estimates of the effect on prices, income, acreage, or marketing restrictions, penalties for violation, and other relevant factors which would result if the referendum is approved, and an equally comprehensive explanation of probable effects if the referendum is disapproved.

SEC. 405. (a) In formulating a market supply adjustment program for any commodity or group of commodities, the Secretary shall determine a national requirement for such commodity or group of commodities.

(b) The national requirement for any commodity for any year shall consist of (1) quantities of such commodity which the Secretary estimates will move through commercial market channels for domestic consumption at not less than the price specified in section 302 for such commodity; (2) the quantity of such commodity certified by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare pursuant to section 202(c) for use in programs specified in such section; (3) the quantity of such commodity required for maintenance of the national food, fiber, and biological oil reserve as certified by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization pursuant to section 203(c); (4) the quantity of such commodity which the Secretary estimates will be exported for dollars at competitive world prices; and (5) the quantity of such commodity certified by the Secretary of State pursuant to section 204(b) for use in programs furthering the interests of the United States abroad and in fulfilling commitments under international agreements.

SEC. 406. (a) The national requirement for any commodity for any year as provided in section 405 shall be reduced by an amount equal to the quantity of such commodity, if any, which is in the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture at the time the national requirement for such commodity is determined, and which will be delivered pursuant to the provisions of sections 202(d), 203(d), and 204(c). The national requirement, after reduction as provided in the foregoing sentence, shall be allocated to States, counties, and individual farms on the basis of production history during the first 9 of the 10 years preceding the year in which the allocation is made, adjusted for abnormal production conditions and trends in yields and land use.

(b) In allocating the national requirement for any commodity, the Secretary, with the advice and assistance of the County Farmer Committees, the State Farmer Advisory Committees, and/or the National Farmer Advisory Committee shall make necessary adjustments so as to provide for fair and equitable treatment for all farm operators, taking into consideration: (1) trends in production, (2) effects of previous acreage diversion or other programs, (3) availability of alternative production opportunities, (4) abnormal weather conditions, (5) sound conservation and land use practices, and (6) requirements for the attainment and maintenance of efficient family farm units.

(c) The national requirement of any commodity shall be expressed in units of production, such as bushels, pounds, or bales, but the national requirement may be expressed in terms of acres in the case of feed grains or other commodities which are used to a substantial extent on the farm where produced.

SEC. 407. The Secretary is authorized and directed to establish necessary incentives, penalties, or compliance deposits to facilitate enforcement of any market supply adjustment program.

SEC. 408. No person who customarily derives more than 50 per centum of his total personal income from sources other than the production of agricultural commodities shall be entitled to any benefits under this Act in excess of $5,000 for any year.

SEC. 409. (a) The Secretary shall utilize the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for carrying out the purposes of titles II, III, and IV of this Act.

TITLE V. CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

SEC. 501. In order to protect the national interest in the conservation and development of soil, water, timber, and other natural resources and to prevent the wasteful and uneconomical use and exploitation of these resources, the Secretary shall establish a resource conservation base which shall consist of contributed acreage, as provided in section 502, and rented acreage, as provided in sections 503 and 504.

SEC. 502. (a) To facilitate the effective administration of this Act, the Secretary shall determine annually the percentage of total cropland in the United States on which no resource depleting commodity shall be produced. Such total acreage shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total crop acreage of the United States.

(b) To be eligible for benefits under this Act, each producer shall designate a portion of the total cropland under his control as producer contributed conservation acreage, and such portion shall be devoted to such soil conservation practices as the Secretary may prescribe. Such portion shall be equal to the percentage determined by the Secretary under subsection (a), after allowing a twenty-acre exemption for each farm.

(c) The Secretary shall share the cost of establishing and maintaining soil conservation practices required under this title in accordance with programs approved under section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. The Secretary shall determine, after consultation with the appropriate State Farmer Advisory Committee and the National Farmer Advisory Committee, the particular program to be effective in any State or area.

SEC. 503. (a) The Secretary shall determine annually the amount of acreage that will be needed to be taken out of production, in addition to the amount determined under section 502(a), in order to bring agricultural production in balance with the food, fiber, and biological oil requirements determined pursuant to section 405 of this Act.

(b) The Secretary shall enter into annual rental agreements with producers to divert from resource depleting uses to soil conservation practices an amount of acreage equal to the amount determined pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, less an amount equal to the amount contracted for under section 504.

(c) The Secretary shall not enter into such agreement with any producer for more than 50 per centum of the total crop land controlled by such producer.

(d) The Secretary shall share with the producer the cost of establishing and maintaining soil conservation practices on lands contracted for under the provisions of this section in accordance with programs approved under section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. The Secretary shall determine, after consultation with the appropriate State Farmer Advisory Committee and the National Farmer Advisory Committee, the particular program to be effective in any State or area.

SEC. 504. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to enter into long-term rental contracts whereby land unsuited or unneeded for the production of agricultural commodities is returned to its original cover or reforested.

(b) The Secretary shall share with the producer the cost of establishing soil conservation practices on lands contracted for under the provisions of this section in accordance with programs approved under section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. The Secretary shall determine, after consultation with the appropriate State Farmer Advisory Committee and The National Farmer Advisory Committee, the particular program to be effective in any State or area.

SEC. 505. The Secretary is authorized to renegotiate any contract entered into under the provisions of subtitle B of the Soil Bank Act in order to provide fair and equitable treatment to all producers under the provisions of this Act.

TITLE VI. AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

SEC. 601. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to establish in the Department of Agriculture an agency to be known as the Agriculture Development Service for the purpose of providing a coordinated program of assistance to low income farm families, and to develop rural areas of low productivity and under employment so as to increase the rate of economic growth and the efficiency of resource utilization.

(b) The Secretary shall appoint an administrator who shall be known as Administrator of the Agriculture Development Service and who shall, under the general supervision and direction of the Secretary, administer the provisions of this title.

(c) To advise the Administrator in the performance of functions authorized by this title, there is authorized to be created an advisory board, composed of representatives of the Departments of Labor, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, and representatives of farm organizations, church groups, labor unions, private businesses, and State welfare and industrial development agencies. The members of such advisory board shall be appointed by the President.

SEC. 602. (a) The Administrator shall designate as "agricultural development areas" those rural counties or parts thereof, parishes, reservations, or areas, where there has existed persistent substandard family farm income which has resulted in depressed economic conditions for the rural area.

(b) Among the factors to be considered by the Administrator in making the designations under subsection (a) are (1) the number of low-income farm families in the various rural areas of the United States, (2) the proportion that such low-income families are to the total farm families of each of such areas, (3) the relationship of the income levels of the families in each such area to the general levels of income in the United States, (4) the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, and (5) the availability of manpower in each such area for supplemental employment.

(c) Any area designated as an agricultural development area pursuant to the provisions of this section shall continue to be so designated as long as the conditions upon which the designation was based persist.

SEC. 603. It shall be the function of the Administrator—

(a) to submit to Congress, in the case of each area designated as an agricultural development area, a program to carry out the purposes of this title with respect to such area;

(b) to cooperate with all departments and agencies of the Federal Government with respect to programs of assistance being made available to persons of low income in rural areas; and

(c) To submit to Congress as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, but not later than December 31, 1960, specific recommendations for legislation required to establish a national program—

(1) provide supervised credit to low income farm families to assist such families in developing an efficient farm unit;

(2) provide the necessary technical advice to low-income farm families to help such families broaden their economic opportunities;

(3) provide opportunities to members of low income farm families in obtaining nonagricultural vocational training; and

(4) assist local and State authorities in developing available and potential resources to provide greater rural industrialization and additional economic opportunities in agricultural development areas designated pursuant to section 602.

TITLE VII. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. (a) As used in this Act the term "Secretary" means Secretary of Agriculture, unless indicated otherwise;

(b) As used in section 408, the term "person" means any individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or agency of a State. Such term shall not include a cooperative marketing organization for the purposes of the limitation on benefits prescribed in such section, but the amount of benefits made available to any person through such cooperative organization shall be included in determining the amount of benefits received by such person for purposes of such limitation.

SEC. 702. The reference in section 306(g) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be deemed to refer to the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 703. Any provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, or of any other Act, providing for acreage allotments, marketing quotas, or price supports for any agricultural commodity, shall be ineffective with respect to the 1960 and subsequent crops of such commodity; but if the Secretary determines that the provisions of this Act cannot be carried out with respect to any commodity for the 1960 crop year, all existing provisions of law relating to such commodity shall continue in effect for such crop year.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Could my distinguished friend from Missouri give us any idea as to what this farm program would cost?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is the Senator asking for a detailed analysis of the cost of the program?

Mr. SCOTT. I was asking for an estimate as to what the Senator's program, in his opinion, would cost if it became law.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Even if this program is adopted, there are still some laws on the books, which would be carried out by the Secretary of Agriculture; but I am confident that one of the problems of the Department of Agriculture in recent years has been the failure to properly enforce controls. Also, unfortunately, many people who are not really farmers have been participating heavily in the programs which were designed primarily to help the efficient family-sized farmers. Both of these matters would be handled in this bill. I would say that if this bill were adopted, the savings to the American taxpayer would be several billion dollars a year.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the Senator not agree that the Secretary of Agriculture is enforcing only those programs which the Congress sends to him?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No, I do not. Last year the Secretary of Agriculture told the Agriculture Committee, of which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is chairman, that he would send us a bill, recommending what he thought should be

done about agriculture. The record will show that he did not send that bill to Congress, and also the stenographic copies of the record were changed, so that when the record was printed it did not say the Secretary of Agriculture had agreed to give us a bill.

This year I would hope we make it clear to the Secretary, as we did last year, that if he will recommend an omnibus bill—which he has never done since I have been on the committee—providing that the bill would reduce inventories and help the family-sized farmer earn a fair share of the national income, we would do our best to see that his proposed legislation was adopted.

Mr. SCOTT. Of course, the Senator does not mean to imply, I am sure, that the Secretary of Agriculture was monkeying with an official transcript of the Senate or of a Senate committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do state, regardless of who did it, that somebody in the Department of Agriculture monkeyed with the official transcript; and that monkeying changed the meaning. I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that when this matter was called to my attention by an able Senator on his side of the aisle, I gave the Senator the facts; and he assured me, after studying the facts, that I was correct.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY WORKERS AND THEIR CHILDREN

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills to alleviate the serious educational problems that have come to light as a result of the investigations of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee's Special Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

The legislation provides for a modest program of Federal assistance to help overcome the unique problems and added burdens connected with the education of the children of our migratory workers and to help improve the fundamental education of the migratory workers themselves.

I ask unanimous consent that the two bills, together with a brief summary of the bills and a table of State participation, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and that the bills lie at the desk until Friday evening of this week so that other Senators who wish to become cosponsors may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and statement will be printed in the RECORD, and the bills will lie at the desk until Friday evening of this week.

The bills, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

S. 2864. A bill to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; and

S. 2865. A bill to provide grants for adult education for migrant agricultural employees.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Since August last year the subcommittee has been conducting a full study of the problems besetting the more than 1 million men, women, and children who perform an indispensable service in providing every one of us with the agricultural necessities of life by traveling from State to State to meet the uniquely heavy seasonal demands of the agricultural industry.

The migratory agricultural workers have often been called our most displaced and forgotten people. Although considerable progress has been made in recent decades through the determined efforts of State and local governments, private organizations and the farmers themselves, the migrant workers still suffer many privations in the area of income, housing, health, and community acceptance.

But perhaps the greatest privation lies in the field of education, particularly for the thousands of children who follow their parents from crop to crop and who, in many cases, rarely see the inside of a school building.

Even in the best of circumstances the constant movement of these migrant children is enough to insure a serious lag in their educational lives. When you add to that the problem of their special environment and upbringing, the fact that they often are needed to work in the fields to help supplement the meager family income, the fact that some parents are unaware of the importance of education, the language barrier frequently present, and the financial difficulty confronting many communities which are suddenly overwhelmed for brief periods by an influx of large numbers of migrant children, it is not hard to appreciate the scope and depth of the problem.

The first bill I have introduced attempts to meet this obvious and vital need for providing the children of our migratory workers with better educational opportunities. The other bill is a small program to help provide the workers themselves with a start in practical education.

I have been gratified to note, Mr. President, the number of farmers who have begun to recognize the benefits to them of having educational opportunities available in their area for migrant children.

During the field hearings held last fall through Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota in the Midwest, and in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, I had occasion to talk to many growers who cited, time after time, the major "headache" and expense resulting from a high and rapid turnover in their migrant working force. Not only did many growers suffer from the problem of having to "break in" a whole new migrant population from year to year, but they often had to suffer the cost and loss of efficiency caused by a steady stream of departures during the course of a single season.

They were also faced with the danger of serious accidents to small children left to their own designs in the field and with the problem of providing care for the children or losing the full efforts of their parents.

Against this backdrop, many farmers who were fortunate enough to be located in an area that provided good educational facilities for migrant children told me how many migrant families returned year after year to the same farms because "here our children can get an education."

Personal experience has taught these farmers what a stabilizing influence an educational program can have in their community. It decreases the turnover, and consequently the expense of finding replacements. It provides a happier and more willing work force. And perhaps not least important, it helps give the farmers themselves a peace of mind they might not otherwise enjoy.

Unfortunately, however, despite the manifest value to the migrant, the farmer and the community of providing good educational opportunities, it is often impossible to do so under existing conditions.

States like Texas with approximately 95,000 domestic migrants at the peak season, or California with around 59,000, or Florida with more than 25,000, simply do not have the funds, instructional capacity or classroom space to cope with the educational needs presented by such an influx. The number of children accompanying these workers can be calculated on the basis of estimates by the Department of Labor that there is approximately one child for every five workers.

It is too much to expect States and local communities to be able to absorb large numbers of migrant children into their existing educational systems for relatively brief periods of the year. Most schools are overcrowded and understaffed as it is, and it is hardly surprising that even the most dedicated community can do very little to shoulder this added and heavy burden.

This is true in our hard-pressed urban areas; the problem is even more acute in the rural sections of the country. It is also understandable that many communities find it hard to rouse sufficient concern over what is, to them, a transitory problem.

But it can be emphatically said that this is far from a transitory problem for the migrant children. It is an everyday problem—every day of their lives.

Mr. President, I intend to make these bills the subject of public hearings by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor during the early part of this session. I am sure that many valuable suggestions will be received from interested witnesses and agency officials for improving this legislation. It is my hope, Mr. President, on the basis of the considerable information already received on the subject and the comments we will receive in the

coming hearings, that legislation dealing with the improvement of educational opportunities for the migrant workers and their children will be perfected and reported favorably during the course of this session.

Passage of this legislation would be a small token of recognition for the many years of silent toil by our migratory workers.

EXHIBIT I

S. 2864

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Migrant Children Educational Assistance Act of 1960".

Findings and purpose of Act

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education. The Congress recognizes, however, that the interstate movement of migrant agricultural employees imposes severe burdens on local educational agencies in discharging their responsibilities with respect to the education of the children of such employees who temporarily reside within their school districts. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide assistance to local educational agencies in providing education to the children of migrant agricultural employees, and to provide for certain planning grants to the States to improve such education.

Federal control of education prohibited

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

Definitions

SEC. 4. As used in this act—

(1) the term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of free public education in a county, township, independent, or other school district located within a State, and includes any State agency which directly operates and maintains facilities for providing free public education;

(2) the term "child" means any child who is within the age limits for which the applicable local educational agency provides free public education;

(3) the term "parent" includes a legal guardian or other person in loco parentis;

(4) the term "migrant agricultural employee" means an individual employed in agriculture, as defined in section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(f)), or performing agricultural labor, as defined in section 3121(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 3121(f)), on a seasonal or other temporary basis in a State where such individual does not maintain a permanent residence, and for the purposes of this Act maintaining a permanent residence shall include the ownership of real property by either such individual or the spouse of such individual;

(5) the term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education;

(6) the term "average daily current expenditures per public school child" means the total current expenditures for a State's public elementary and secondary schools during a particular year divided by the product of the average daily attendance in such schools during such year times the number of schooldays in such year; the term "current expenditures" means expenditures for free public education in such schools to the extent that such expenditures are made from current revenues, except that such term does not include any such expenditure for the acquisition of land, the erection of facilities, interest, or debt service; and for the purposes of payments under title I for attendance during any academic year the Commissioner shall determine and use the average daily current expenditures per public school child for the year preceding such academic year;

(7) the term "institution of higher education" means any such institution which is accredited as such by a nationally recognized accrediting agency; and

(8) the term "migrant agricultural employee State" means any State which has—

(A) at least five counties with one hundred or more but less than five hundred such employees in each such county;

(B) at least two counties with one hundred or more but less than five hundred such employees in each such county and one county with five hundred or more but less than three thousand such employees;

(C) at least two counties with five hundred or more but less than three thousand such employees in each such county; or

(D) at least one county with three thousand or more such employees;

and determinations for the purpose of this definition shall be made for the most recent year that satisfactory population figures are available from reliable sources.

Administration

SEC. 5. (a) The Commissioner shall administer this Act, and he may make such regulations and perform such other functions as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Commissioner shall include in his annual report to the Congress a full report of the administration of his functions under this Act, including a detailed statement of disbursements.

TITLE I—PAYMENTS TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES FOR ASSISTANCE IN EDUCATING CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEES

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 101. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and for the four succeeding fiscal years, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

Payments

SEC. 102. (a) Upon application in accordance with the provisions of this section for the school year beginning in 1960, or for any of the four succeeding school years, by a local educational agency in any State, the Commissioner shall pay to such agency an amount equal to 75 percent with respect to the school years beginning in 1960 and 1961 and 50 percent with respect to the school years beginning in 1962, 1963, and 1964, of the average daily current expenditures per public school child, for the State in which such agency is located, for each day's attendance in excess of 10 during such school year in the free public elementary or secondary schools of such agency, by a child of a parent who is a migrant agricultural employee.

(b) Payments under this section shall be made for attendance during the regular school year beginning in 1960, and the four succeeding school years, and may be made at such intervals as the Commissioner deems appropriate. Such payments shall me made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

(c) An application under the provisions of this section shall be in such form and contain such information as may be required by the Commissioner to carry out the provisions of this section, and the Commissioner may require such additional information and reports at such intervals during the school year as he deems necessary.

TITLE II—GRANTS FOR SUMMER SCHOOLS FOR CHILDREN OF PARENTS WHO ARE MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEES

Appropriations

SEC. 201. There is authorized to be appropriated $300,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, for grants under the provisions of this title.

Allotments and grants

SEC. 202. Amounts appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year shall be allotted among the migrant agricultural employee States on the basis of their relative populations of migrant agricultural employees for the most recent year that such populations are available from reliable sources. A State's allotment under this section shall be available during the year for which made and the succeeding fiscal year for payments in accordance with the provisions of this title for the operating costs of conducting necessary summer school sessions for children of migrant agricultural employees. As used in this section the term "operating costs" includes all ordinary costs of operation other than any costs for the acquisition of facilities or costs related to any such acquisition.

Application and payments

SEC. 203. The Commissioner shall approve any application for funds provided under this title if such application—

(1) is from a local educational agency or an institution of higher education within a State;

(2) sets out the summer school program, and the necessity therefor, the operating costs of such summer school, and the amount needed under the provisions of this title to defray such costs; and

(3) provides that such agency or institution will make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require, and, to assure verification of such reports, give the Commissioner upon request, access to the records upon which the information is based.

Upon approval of any such application the Commissioner shall pay, in such installments as he may deem appropriate, to such agency or institution, out of the allotment to the State in which such agency or institution is located, the amount requested, or in the event requests from agencies and institutions in any State are in excess of such State's allotment, such lesser amount as the Commissioner deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

TITLE III—PLANNING GRANTS

Appropriations

SEC. 301. There is authorized to be appropriated $250,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years for grants under the provisions of this title.

Allotments and grants

SEC. 302. Amounts appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year shall be

populations of migrant agricultural employee States on the basis of their relative populations of migrant agricultural employees for the most recent year that such populations are available from reliable sources. A State's allotment under this section shall be available during the year for which made for payments in accordance with the provisions of this title (1) to survey the need for summer school sessions for children of parents who are migrant agricultural employees; (2) to develop plans for such sessions where needed; (3) to develop and carry out programs to encourage such children to attend school during the regular academic year and such summer sessions, and to improve the quality of education offered such children; and (4) to coordinate programs provided for in this Act with similar programs in other States, including the transmittal of pertinent information with respect to school records of such children. Grants under the provisions of this title shall not be available for the cost of acquisition of any facilities.

Application and payments

SEC. 303. The Commissioner shall approve any application for funds provided under this title if such application—

(1) designates the State agency which will carry out the program for which the funds are to be used;

(2) sets out such program in sufficient detail to satisfy the Commissioner that it carries out the purposes of this title; and

(3) provides that such agency will make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require, and, to assure verification of such reports, give the Commissioner, upon request, access to the records upon which the information is based.

Upon approval of any such application the Commissioner shall pay, in such installments as he may deem appropriate, to such agency out of its State allotment the amount requested. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

S. 2865

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Migrant Agricultural Employee Adult Education Act of 1960".

Federal control of education prohibited

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

Definitions

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of free public education in a county, township, independent, or other school district located within a State, and includes any State agency which directly operates and maintains facilities for providing free public education;

(2) the term "migrant agricultural employee" means an individual employed in agriculture, as defined in section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(f)), or performing agricultural labor, as defined in section 3121 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 3121(f)), on a seasonal or other temporary basis in a State where such individual does not maintain a permanent residence, and for the purposes of this Act maintaining a permanent residence shall include the ownership of real property by either such individual or the spouse of such individual;

(3) the term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education;

(4) the term "institution of higher education" means any such institution which is accredited as such by a nationally recognized accrediting agency; and

(5) the term "migrant agricultural employee State" means any State which has—

(A) at least five counties with one hundred or more but less than five hundred such employees in each such county;

(B) at least two counties with one hundred or more but less than five hundred such employees in each such county and one county with five hundred or more but less than three thousand such employees;

(C) at least two counties with five hundred or more but less than three thousand such employees in each such county; or

(D) at least one county with three thousand or more such employees;

and determinations for the purpose of this definition shall be made for the most recent year that satisfactory population figures are available from reliable sources.

Administration

SEC. 4. (a) The Commissioner shall administer this Act, and he may make such regulations and perform such other functions as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Commissioner shall include in his annual report to the Congress a full report of the administration of his functions under this Act, including a detailed statement of disbursements.

Appropriations

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated $250,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, for grants under the provisions of this Act.

Allotments and grants

SEC. 6. Amounts appropriated pursuant to section 5 for any fiscal year shall be allotted among the migrant agricultural employee States on the basis of their relative populations of migrant agricultural employees for the most recent year that such populations are available from reliable sources. A State's allotment under this section shall be available during the year for which made for payments in accordance with the provisions of this Act for the operating costs of conducting adult education classes for migrant agricultural employees and their spouses. As used in this section the term "operating costs" includes all ordinary costs of operation other than any costs for the acquisition of facilities or costs related to any such acquisition.

Application and payments

SEC. 7. The Commissioner shall approve any application for funds provided under this Act if such application—

(1) is from a local educational agency or an institution of higher education within a State;

(2) sets out a program of adult education classes for migrant agricultural employees and their spouses which provides fundamental education and training for healthful modern living, the operating costs of such classes, and the amount needed under the provisions of this Act to defray such costs; and

(3) provides that such agency or institution will make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require, and, to assure verification of such reports, give the Commissioner upon request, access to the records upon which the information is based.

Upon approval of any such application the Commissioner shall pay, in such installments as he may deem appropriate, to such agency or institution, out of the allotment to the State in which such agency or institution is located, the amount requested, or in the event requests from agencies and institutions in any State are in excess of such State's allotment, such lesser amount as the Commissioner deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

First. The first bill I have introduced would provide a 5-year program of Federal assistance for the education of our migrant children. It is a sound, workable program of modest sum which, I believe, will provide great improvement in this vital area. The proposals are based upon information drawn from the hearings held by the subcommittee and upon the considered judgment of people who have spent many years dealing with the problem.

Briefly, the bill would provide matching funds to help defray the added expense of educating the children of migratory workers for whom there is no direct local school tax during the regular school session, a program of grants totaling $300,000 for the establishment of summer schools, and a program of planning grants totaling $250,000 to promote interstate cooperation, the development of educational programs, materials and demonstrations, and the transmission of school records for migrant children.

To help bear the additional cost of educating these children during the regular school session, the Federal Government would for the first 2 years pay 75 percent of the State's cost of educating the child for each day of attendance. Thereafter, the Federal Government would share 50 percent of the cost.

On the basis of estimates prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this program would cost slightly more than $2 million.

The grants for the establishment of summer schools for migrant children is, to me, perhaps potentially the most rewarding part of the program, for a well-run summer school averaging from 6 to 8 weeks in duration could well be the longest uninterrupted educational experience that the migrant child will have in a given year. For that reason, a relatively small amount of money spent wisely in the right areas might yield benefits far beyond what normally might be expected.

It is estimated on the basis of pilot projects conducted in Colorado, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey that the average cost of a 6-week summer school is approximately $5,000. The sum authorized in this bill would therefore provide money for the establishment of 60 such schools which could pattern their activities on the projects that have proved so successful thus far.

It is anticipated that the States and local communities will provide the school buildings and maintenance costs, with the Federal Government paying for the administrative, instructional, food, transportation, and other operating costs.

The planning grants, as I indicated earlier, would serve a number of valuable purposes. The grants would provide funds to help stimulate interest and leadership at the State level. They would assist in the preparation of plans and methods for the operation of summer schools. They would encourage in-

terstate cooperation so that the educational pattern of the child will be interrupted as little as possible. And they will help facilitate the transfer of the child's school records so that a teacher will not have to spend so many precious days trying to find out what ground the child's last teacher has covered.

These three programs, when added together and put into operation over a period of years, will, I am certain, achieve tremendous results at a minimal cost.

Second. The second bill I have introduced has been inspired directly by the information arising from the hearings and talks with the farmers. Perhaps the strongest and most justifiable complaint raised by the growers time and time again might be paraphrased something like this:

"Well, I've done a lot of things to improve the living conditions of the migrants who work on my farm. I've built them new housing, put in toilet facilities, new showers, cooking facilities, nice new bedding, plenty of garbage cans—and what happens? They mark up the walls, kick holes in the window screens, stop up the toilets, pull the knobs off the showers and stoves, tear the blankets, and tip over the garbage cans."

Unfortunately many of these things have happened on many farms and one can hardly be anything but extremely sympathetic to the farmer who provides good facilities only to have them abused, damaged, and sometimes wrecked. Sometimes this kind of damage is done by workers who lack the self-respect to care. Sometimes it is the result of a simple lack of knowledge of what the facilities are for.

In both cases the root problem is a lack of fundamental education and knowledge of modern living. It is to this problem that the second bill is directed. A sum of $250,000 is authorized for a program of practical education for the migratory workers themselves.

Based on the experimental programs so far conducted, particularly those held in two counties in Wisconsin in 1957 and 1958, I believe this is an area that could and should be explored more fully as a means for improving the living conditions of the migrants and increasing their self-respect, as well as providing a basis for protecting the interests and expenses of the farmers themselves.

Essentially this program follows along the path so successfully blazed by the Cooperative Extension Service, which now combines the efforts of some 11,000 county extension workers and 1.2 million voluntary local leaders to provide information about home economics and agricultural methods to more than 12 million people.

This bill would provide grants to States with serious migratory worker problems to help organize instructional programs and stimulate local activity and interest. There are, of course, a multitude of ways in which such a program could be of help. It could provide for meetings, demonstrations, and films on such subjects as the relationship between sanitary facilities and personal health, the preparation of family budgets and methods of handling family finances, instruction in clothes care and nutritious and economical preparation of food, and so forth.

The advantages of this program, I am sure, will far outweigh the very modest expense involved.

The following is a table, prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, of estimates of State participation under the Migrant Children Education Assistance Act, provided the minimum standards regarding the eligibility for participation contained in section 4(8) of the act are met:

Estimated cost of ADA payments to States based on 1959 data

	Total migrants	Number of migrant children	Amount paid per pupil	Estimated daily attendance	Amount paid for migrant children
1. Alabama	3,400	680	$1.00	15	$10,200.00
2. Arizona	7,998	1,600	1.25	20	40,000.00
3. Arkansas	4,875	975	1.00	15	14,625.00
4. California	59,680	11,935	1.25	20	288,375.00
5. Colorado	10,056	2,010	1.25	15	37,687.50
6. Connecticut	4,540	905	1.25	20	22,625.00
7. Delaware	4,747	945	1.50	15	21,162.50
8. District of Columbia.[1]					
9. Florida	25,347	5,065	1.00	20	101,300.00
10. Georgia	5,300	1,060	1.00	15	15,300.00
11. Idaho	8,875	1,775	1.00	15	26,625.00
12. Illinois	7,499	1,495	1.25	15	28,131.25
13. Indiana	6,989	1,195	1.00	15	17,925.00
14. Iowa	773	155	1.25	15	2,906.25
15. Kansas	20,850	4,170	1.00	15	62,550.00
16. Kentucky	3,450	690	1.00	15	10,350.00
17. Louisiana	5,075	1,015	1.25	15	10,031.25
18. Maine	404	80	1.00	15	1,200.00
19. Maryland	13,038	2,605	1.25	15	48,843.75
20. Massachusetts	1,614	325	1.25	15	6,093.75
21. Michigan	46,543	9,305	1.25	20	232,625.00
22. Minnesota	5,399	1,075	1.00	15	16,125.00
23. Mississippi	1,274	255	1.00	15	3,825.00
24. Missouri	13,155	2,630	1.00	15	39,450.00
25. Montana	7,172	1,035	1.25	15	19,406.25
26. Nebraska	4,052	810	1.00	15	12,150.00
27. Nevada	614	105	$1.25	15	$1,968.75
28. New Hampshire	308	60	1.00	15	900.00
29. New Jersey	13,055	2,610	1.50	20	78,300.00
30. New Mexico	1,506	300	2.00	20	12,000.00
31. New York	27,934	5,585	2.00	15	167,550.00
32. North Carolina	13,707	2,540	1.00	15	38,100.00
33. North Dakota	7,213	1,440	1.00	15	21,600.00
34. Ohio	9,987	1,995	1.00	15	29,925.00
35. Oklahoma	11,050	2,210	1.00	15	33,150.00
36. Oregon	20,176	4,035	1.25	15	75,656.25
37. Pennsylvania	7,355	1,470	1.25	15	27,562.50
38. Rhode Island [1]					
39. South Carolina	3,650	730	1.00	15	10,950.00
40. South Dakota	2,000	400	1.00	15	6,000.00
41. Tennessee	477	95	1.00	15	1,425.00
42. Texas	95,610	19,120	1.00	20	282,400.00
43. Utah	1,622	325	1.00	15	4,875.00
44. Vermont	220	45	1.00	15	675.00
45. Virginia	10,595	2,115	1.00	15	31,725.00
46. Washington	18,109	3,620	1.25	15	67,875.00
47. West Virginia	130	25	1.25	15	375.00
48. Wisconsin	11,752	2,350	1.25	15	44,062.50
49. Wyoming	2,241	445	1.25	15	8,343.75
Total					2,044,025.00

[1] No data available.

REMOVAL OF LIMITATION OF EARNINGS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on February 26 of last year, I introduced a bill—S. 1168—for the removal of the existing limit on the earnings of persons receiving social security benefits. I hope that within the coming weeks action will be taken by Congress to implement this proposal into law.

It is my impression that considerable public opinion now favors liberalization of our social security system. It is widely recognized that America's senior citizens deserve far better treatment than they have been getting. A full examination of the level and structure of our social security system is definitely needed.

An articulate constituent of mine, in writing to support certain important changes in our social security system cited the following literary reference which I think is extremely appropriate in this connection:

When all the world is young, lad,
And all the grass is green,
And every goose a swan, lad,
And every lass a queen,
Then ho: for boot and horse, lad,
Across the world away—
Young blood will have its course, lad,
And every dog his day.
When all the world is old, lad,
And all the grass is brown,
When every sport is stale, lad,
And all the wheels run down,
Creep home and find your place there,
The spent and maimed among;
God grant you find one face there,
You loved when all was young.

Mr. President, my bill—S. 1168—to remove the earnings limit is, in my mind, of the highest priority in the way of revising and improving the social security system. There is a very important and basically human reason for removing this limit. Many older persons are far more contented if they are are able to continue to work after they have reached retirement age. Under present law, many such persons are deterred from doing so because they feel that they have paid for social security and should not surrender these benefits as a result of the existing limitation on earnings. This most certainly should not be the case. The dignity and self-satisfaction derived from work are of the highest importance and should be permitted to all Americans, young and old alike.

In a recent Gallup survey it was found that the overwhelming majority of Americans favor removing the social security earnings limit. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gallup's column on this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY EARNING LIMIT HIT

(By George Gallup)

The American public favors the idea of letting its senior citizens work to the full limit of their earning power without losing

any of the social security benefits which have accrued to them.

Current limitations, as the public sees it, just do not provide the average retired person with adequate income in today's high-cost-of-living conditions.

Under present law, any person between the ages of 65 and 72 who earns more than $1,200 a year loses at least some of his social security payments. If his earnings are in excess of $2,080 a year, he may get no monthly benefits at all.

The question as to whether existing laws should be changed has raised much controversy and undoubtedly will be injected into the political campaign in 1960.

A nationwide survey by the Gallup poll on retirement benefits finds these are the highlights of the public's thinking on the issue:

A substantial majority of the public (two out of three) believes that the present restrictions on earning should be changed. Chiefly, people believe that the current limits are not realistic in today's economy.

A slightly smaller majority, in fact, would permit persons on social security to earn as much as they wish at a job and still be eligible for all payments.

This is the first question put to a representative cross section of American adults of all ages by Gallup poll reporters:

"A person over 65 who works full time and earns more than $1,200 a year cannot receive social security payments. Do you think this law should or should not be changed?"

Here is the vote:

	Percent
Should be	67
Should not	23
No opinion	10

The next question:

"Do you think persons over 65 should be permitted to earn as much as they can and still get their full social security payments, or not?"

	Percent
Should be able	62
Should not	31
No opinion	7

(Under a law, effective this year, a retired person may actually earn more than $2,080 a year and still get some benefits if the work is not of a full-time nature. For any month in which a person between 65 and 72 does not earn $100, he may qualify for a social security check.

(Theoretically, therefore, a retired person could earn the full $2,080 or even more in any one month and nothing the remaining months of the year and still get 11 social security payments.)

The American public has supported the general principal of old-age benefits from the very beginning of the plan nearly a quarter of a century ago.

In January 1936, for example, as the program was just getting started, 9 out of 10 Americans in a Gallup poll favored the idea of a Government old-age pension. At the end of that year, 7 out of 10 favored the plan as it now works—that is, a joint tax on employers and employees for old-age pensions.

During World War II, when, in 1943, the question of expanding social security benefits to include sickness, disability, doctors and hospital bills arose, a substantial majority of the public backed such a move.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am well aware that there are many who feel that the proposal to completely remove the earnings limitation goes somewhat too far. A constituent of mine, Mr. D. S. Sargent, personnel director of Consolidated Edison, Inc., has called my attention to a similar although more moderate proposal regarding the earnings limitation. I should like to give this Congress the benefit of Mr. Sargent's wide experience and great ability in this field. For this reason, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill encompassing Mr. Sargent's proposal on the social security earnings limit.

This bill would raise what I call the chargeback figure from $80 in present law to $254. This amount, $254, is the maximum family monthly social security payment permitted at the present time.

Under existing social security statutes, an individual can earn $1,200 per year—that is, $100 per month—without losing any social security benefits. If his income is over $1,200, he now loses 1 month's benefits for every $80 or fraction thereof in additional earnings. Should his monthly social security check be greater than $80, he may well lose more than a dollar in benefits for each dollar earned above the $1,200 limit. It is well to note here that most social security monthly benefits are higher than the current $80 chargeback figure.

By making the maximum monthly benefit allowed the same as the chargeback figure, as in the proposed bill, we establish in law the principle that for each dollar earned over $1,200 per year, an individual covered under social security cannot lose more than $1 in benefits. Under this bill, the social security earnings limitation would no longer prevent an individual from continuing to work beyond retirement age.

I believe that this proposal is logical and straightforward. If one understands the mechanics of the social security program, the proposal is not complicated or especially technical.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following figures and brief statement, which further illustrate the impact and intent of this bill, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Explanation of social security earnings limit proposal

	Annual income, man age 65, wife and children receiving maximum benefit [1]	
	Present	Proposed
Social security payments (12×$254=$3,048)	$3,048	$3,048
Can earn without penalty	1,200	1,200
Total possible income (including $1,200 in salary)	4,248	4,248
If he earns $1,454 in a year; that is, $1,200 plus the equivalent of 1 social security check ($254):		
Social security eligibility	[2] 2,032	[3] 2,794
Earnings from employment	1,454	1,454
Total income	3,486	4,248
Decrease in total income resulting from additional work	[4] 762	0

[1] Maximum benefit is $254 per month.
[2] Four monthly benefits lost (4 times $80, or a fraction thereof, in additional income).
[3] One monthly benefit lost under proposed bill.
[4] Represents 3 payments net loss (3×$254=$762). 1 lost benefit of $254 compensated by the extra $254 in income.

The proposed amendment consists of enlarging the charge-back figure of $80 to one of $254. As the sum of $254 has the individual significance of being the maximum monthly benefit check any individual may receive under the present social security legislation (and that for a beneficiary who has a qualifying spouse and one or more qualifying children), the net result of this substitution of figures is to enable all social security beneficiaries who lose all or a portion of such benefits by accumulating earnings in excess of $1,200 per taxable year to forfeit no greater sum of such benefits than that which they have earned in excess of $1,200 per year. In illustration of this fact consider the individual beneficiary whose monthly benefit is $116, or the beneficiary with qualifying spouse whose monthly check might be $174—both of these beneficiaries are able to earn a greater amount in excess of $1,200 per year than the sum of the social security checks for such year that they lose by such excess earnings.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I want to conclude my remarks on this proposal by reiterating what I said in the beginning of my statement. I strongly and enthusiastically favor the complete removal of the existing limitation on earnings for persons receiving social security benefits. The bill which I have introduced today in my opinion does not go far enough. But if the proposal contained in this bill more clearly reflects the tenor of Congress, then I certainly want to see to it that it is brought to our attention. It most certainly represents a step in the right direction and I urge that it be given full and careful consideration by the Congress in the months ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I introduce today be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill—S. 2866—to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to relax the severity of existing provisions with respect to deductions from benefits on account of earnings, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (2) of section 203(e) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "$80" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$254".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective, in the case of any individual, with respect to taxable years of such individual ending after the month in which this Act is enacted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I came to the floor while my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] was speaking. I am glad to associate myself with him in the effort to remove the existing limit on the earnings of social security beneficiaries. I have taken up the torch which divine providence caused Senator Langer to lay down. I am delighted that my colleague from New York feels as Senator Langer did about this matter.

CONVENTION WITH CUBA FOR CONSERVATION OF SHRIMP

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to give effect to the Convention Between the United States of America and Cuba for the Conservation of Shrimp, signed at Havana, August 15, 1958. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2867) to give effect to the Convention Between the United States of America and Cuba for the Conservation of Shrimp, signed at Havana, August 15, 1958, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
September 12, 1959.

HON. RICHARD NIXON,
President of the Senate.

SIR: There is submitted herewith for consideration of the Congress a draft bill entitled "A bill to give effect to the Convention Between the United States of America and Cuba for the Conservation of Shrimp, signed at Havana, August 15, 1958." The convention entered into force September 4, 1959.

The Bureau of the Budget has informed the Department that it has no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Very truly yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON,
Acting Secretary.

ELIMINATION OF POLL TAX AS VOTING REQUIREMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for myself, for the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] as the principal cosponsor, and 22 other Senators, whose names I shall read into the RECORD, a bill to eliminate by statute the poll tax and other taxes or property qualifications as a bar to voting in national elections.

I introduce the bill as an original measure and also as a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 126, a proposed constitutional amendment to do away with the poll tax, which was introduced in the last session of Congress. Seventeen Senators who previously supported Senate Joint Resolution 126 have now joined as cosponsors of the measure I am introducing today, which would substitute for that constitutional amendment a statutory means to achieve the same objective.

The Senators who have joined with the Senator from Illinois and myself are the following: The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], who is the present distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2868) to protect the right to vote in national elections by making unlawful the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting in such elections, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the enactment of the bill would eliminate the poll tax requirements in five States where it still stands as a prerequisite for voting: Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia. Also, it would remove any other economic disqualifications for voting, other than a poll tax which are at present on the books in Florida, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, and South Carolina.

The bill to eliminate the poll tax by statute is also being introduced, as I have said, as an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 126. It is my intention to substitute it for that constitutional amendment as the parliamentary situation will allow. It is my understanding that floor consideration of both these approaches to the poll tax repeal—that is, the constitutional amendment route or the statutory route—may be imminent, for I understand that Senate Joint Resolution 126 may be offered in the very near future as an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 39, a constitutional amendment dealing with the filling of vacancies in the House of Representatives in a time of national disaster.

Certainly the objective of constitutional amendment to repeal the poll tax or to eliminate the poll tax is an extremely vital one in regard to the national effort to further secure the voting rights of all qualified citizens. But I cannot support it, for two important reasons, and favor instead the enactment of a statutory means capable of achieving the same result with equal, if not added, effectiveness.

First, as a lawyer, I believe it is most inadvisable to use a constitutional amendment to do what I am convinced Congress is fully capable of doing by statute. It is particularly unwise, moreover, to invoke such practice when dealing with a question, like the poll tax, which has major ramifications in the civil rights field, where it seems inevitable that on many major bills to secure these rights, charges of unconstitutionality are constantly raised with respect to rights which are already, in fact, guaranteed by the Constitution.

Such questions are being raised already, for example, with respect to Federal voting registrars. If once we adopt the idea that we have to proceed in this field by constitutional amendment, it seems to me we handicap ourselves in the normal current of civil rights legislation. Therefore, if we do not need a constitutional amendment—and I think I can demonstrate that irrefutably in the legal discussion which will take place—then we who believe in eliminating the poll tax as a requirement for voting should certainly not seek to do it ourselves.

Then, too, Mr. President, as everyone knows, the constitutional amendment method is a very difficult and cumbersome one; for example, between 1927 and 1959, 1,819 constitutional amendments were proposed, but only 3 of that enormous number were ratified by the States as amendments to the U.S. Constitution. So it seems to me that is another reason why we should not take the constitutional amendment route.

Mr. President, I was extremely heartened to review again the remarks made by the sponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 126, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the very distinguished sponsor of the constitutional amendment idea, and also the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and other Members of the Senate at the time when the constitutional amendment joint resolution was introduced on August 6, 1959. They expressed with great sincerity their personal convictions that the poll tax should be removed, so that every citizen—regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin—who can qualify under State law to vote should be able to do so. However, their assurances that they believed this constitutional amendment would speedily be ratified were made before the report of the President's Civil Rights Commission was issued in September of last year. In light of the Commissioners' blanket indictment of the methods used to prevent—because of their race—otherwise qualified citizens from registering to vote in primaries and other Federal elections, I find it impossible to share a sense of optimism over the prospects of fast approval by the legislatures of the several States on such a constitutional amendment.

As the national income and per capita earnings have risen fairly steadily in recent years, there has been a tendency to downgrade the importance of the poll tax as a real financial barrier to qualified citizens who wish to vote; rather, it is decried as an archaic impediment and annoyance. While this may be true in some areas, I have obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau some rather interesting statistics which indicate that in certain States, such as Mississippi, the

poll tax requirement could easily absorb at least half the weekly paycheck of a Negro voter who might otherwise be qualified to vote.

In 1957, the most recent year for which statistics are available, the average nonwhite wage earner in the South had an income of about $23 a week. In Mississippi, where the average income of nonwhites is still lower, the State has a cumulative 3-year poll tax requirement which can necessitate the payment by a voter of a total of $9, including $3 to cover each preceding election year during which no poll tax was paid. Thus, if a husband and wife, for example who live in Mississippi wished to vote, and could meet all the other State qualifications, they would have to pay a minimum total of $6, and they might have to pay a maximum of $18.

However, while it probably is true that the poll tax is not necessarily a prohibitive factor in regards to voting in most other States, it is one more well-known technique which is used in many areas of the South to further discourage Negroes from registering and voting at all. Therefore, through the introduction of this proposed legislation today, we are seeking to remedy this situation, through enactment by the Congress of a statute eliminating the use of poll tax and similar devices.

Mr. President, I conclude by saying that if one thing has stood out in the civil rights debates it is the fact that all of us agree that the first and primary thing for anyone to ask, even on a minimal basis, is that the Negro be given the right to vote; and that is what we are seeking by means of this measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments, in the nature of a substitute, submitted by the Senator from New York, on behalf of himself and other Senators, to Senate Joint Resolution 126, will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESTORATION OF SIZE AND WEIGHT LIMITATIONS ON CERTAIN FOURTH-CLASS MAIL MATTER

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to restore the size and weight limitations on parcel post packages mailed to or from Alaska and Hawaii, as those limits existed prior to statehood.

As territories, residents of these two new States could send packages through first-class post offices up to 100 inches in length and girth, and weighing up to 70 pounds. However, statehood brought both Hawaii and Alaska under the tighter limitations which apply to the States of the mainland. These are 72 inches and 40 pounds for first-class post offices, as in Honolulu.

There is pending before this body Senate bill 1306, introduced by the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], which would make these larger limits generally applicable throughout our Nation. I am strongly in favor of S. 1306, because it seems obvious to me that the limits now imposed on parcel post shipments are inadequate and inconvenient for users of the U.S. mails. However, to emphasize the special need for continuing in Hawaii and Alaska the larger limitation which we enjoyed as Territories, limitations geared to our geographical position and completely unrelated to our territorial status, I am introducing this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2869) to restore the size and weight limitations on fourth-class matter mailed to or from Alaska and Hawaii which existed prior to their admission as States, introduced by Mr. LONG of Hawaii (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. FONG, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959—AMENDMENTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. GORE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2436, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF COAL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, at the next printing of the bill—S. 1362—to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, to contract for coal research and for other purposes, introduced by me on March 10, 1959, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators DIRKSEN, MURRAY, RANDOLPH, BYRD of West Virginia, SCOTT, COOPER, MORTON, BEALL, and BUTLER may be added as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] be added as a cosponsor to the bill—S. 2755—to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit, the next time the bill is printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTRUCTION LOANS FOR BRACKISH WATER CONVERSION PLANTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 14, 1960, the names of Mr. GOLDWATER and Mr. FONG were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2816) to authorize loans for the design and construction of sea and brackish water conversion plants, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators) on January 14, 1960.

ISSUANCE OF GOLD MEDAL IN RECOGNITION OF SERVICES OF DR. THOMAS A. DOOLEY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, last week I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 148, which would authorize the striking of a medal for Dr. Thomas Dooley for his remarkable services to humanity. I am happy to report there are some 41 Senators who have already joined in sponsorship of this resolution. The authority to join the resolution as a sponsor expired last night, but since that time the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], have indicated they wish to cosponsor the resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of these Senators may be added as cosponsors, and that when the joint resolution is reprinted they be shown among the sponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR DURUM WHEAT—MOTION TO RECONSIDER—REQUEST FOR HOUSE TO RETURN BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter a motion for the reconsideration of Senate bill 1282, which was passed on August 21, 1959, and concerns production of Durum wheat.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the motion will be entered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk of the Senate be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate bill 1282.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, 5 and 6 years ago type 15b rust virtually wiped out our domestic production of Durum wheat from which macaroni, spaghetti, and similar doughy products are produced. Production fell from more than 30 million bushels to less than 5 million.

With the aid of new irradiation techniques, we developed rust-resistant strains, meantime permitting farmers to plant extra acres to Durum for each acre of allotted wheat acreage they would put in the crop. In Montana, South Dakota, Minnesota, and California, farmers who had once produced Durum were induced

to plant the crop again to maintain the semolina products industry, and this market for a farm product.

The bonus for planting allotted wheat acreage to Durum has been reduced with the development of rust-resistant strains. Now we find that we are not keeping up with demand, and that it is advisable to offer a small, 25-percent bonus to wheat producers to shift from types of wheat in surplus to this needed type.

Our carryover, or beginning stocks of Durum in the 1958–59 marketing season were 26 million bushels. This carryover has dropped to 20 million bushels, although we had an unusually high yield of 23.8 bushels per harvested acre in 1958. We had nearly a third increase in acreage in 1959, but our stocks of Durum are going to decline another 6 million bushels this year.

The Department of Agriculture now estimates our crop of 21 million bushels will be 6 million bushels short of disappearance and we will be down to 14 million bushels of stocks on July 1. There will have been a nearly 50-percent decline in stocks—from 27 million to 14 million bushels—in just 2 years.

When the Senate passed S. 1282 last August, we limited the 25 percent extra acreage allowed for planting Durum to growers who planted their entire wheat acreage allotment to Durum varieties. There are some farmers in my own State of Montana, in Minnesota, South Dakota, and California who would help meet our Durum requirements with such an inducement, but they do not want to gamble their entire income by planting their whole acreage allotment to this type of wheat. In the areas outside North Dakota, Durum is not so certain a crop as other wheats.

We believe that we have now worked out some agreement among growing areas on a proper bill and it is desired to recall S. 1282, amend and reenact it so it will be satisfactory to all concerned and more effectively meet our Durum requirements.

To the extent that farmers can be encouraged to produce a variety of wheat in demand, and not plagued by surpluses, we will reduce the production of varieties which are in surplus. Although limited geographic areas produce Durum, its production, instead of surplus varieties, is in the interest of all wheat producers and the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that some figures on the Durum wheat situation be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USDA figures on the Durum wheat situation

[000 omitted]

	1958–59	1959–60 [1]	1960–61
Beginning stocks bushels	26,000	20,000	14,000
Production do	21,679	21,018	
Imports do	174	175	
Total supply do	47,853	41,193	

[1] Calculations based on December Crop Report.

USDA figures on the Durum wheat situation—Continued

DISAPPEARANCE

[000 ommitted]

	1958–59	1959–60]	1960–61
Food	23,000	22,850	
Feed and losses	2,442	1,968	
Seed	1,767	1,775	
Total domestic disappearance	27,209	26,593	
Exports:			
Grain	0	0	
Semolina and flour	498	425	
Macaroni and products	146	175	
Total export disappearance	644	600	
Total disappearance	27,853	27,193	
Carryout	20,000	14,000	

PRODUCTION STATISTICS

[Actual figures]

Acres planted	932,000	1,283,000	
Yield bushels	22.9	16.1	
Acres harvested	900,000	1,220,000	
Yield bushels	23.8	17.0	

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT REPORT ENTITLED "FARM PRICE AND INCOME PROJECTIONS, 1960–65" (S. DOC. NO. 77)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report, entitled "Farm Price and Income Projections, 1960–65," which report is based upon conditions approximating unlimited production and marketing of agricultural products and which was prepared by the technical staff of the Department of Agriculture and an advisory committee of land-grant college economists be printed as a Senate document. At a session of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on this day I was authorized to make such a request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief comment on the findings. It is an objective, unbiased report. The basic data and conclusions were gathered and prepared by a group of the most competent technicians in the Department of Agriculture, at my request. The conclusions and evaluation were prepared by a committee of experts from several of the leading land-grant colleges. These conclusions, based upon conditions approximating free production and marketing of agricultural products in 1960–65, show that farmers' net income would fall to about $7 billion, which would mean less than 1½ percent of the gross national product at this time. This would be a drop of 46 percent from 1958, or less than half the net income farmers received in 1952, the year before this administration took office.

While it is true that the assumptions underlying these projections do not correspond exactly to the administration's present farm program, the report shows what would result under a program without any acreage controls or similar limitations, such as is apparently advocated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Specialized wheat producers under a wide-open program would find their net incomes reduced by one-half to three-fourths.

Even the largest and most efficient irrigated cotton producers would find their net incomes sharply reduced. Smaller dry land cotton producers would have to give up growing cotton.

Corn Belt feed grain and hog producers, in spite of sharply increased production, would find their net cash incomes almost one-half smaller than in recent years.

Mr. President, I need not go further to demonstrate that the so-called open throttle farm program of this administration is really a program which would throttle the farmer. It is worse than that. It is a program which would force most of agriculture into financial bankruptcy.

For several years now I have asked Mr. Benson to furnish the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with estimates of price and income effects of his recommendations. Now I see why he has been so unwilling to comply with my requests.

This objective report, the basic data for which were gathered by the most competent people in the Department of Agriculture, concludes that production will continue to increase at the rate of about 2 percent a year in spite of a sharp drop in farm prices. This is what many members of the Senate committee have contended by time after time it has been denied by Secretary Benson. Mr. President, is it surprising that farmers have lost confidence in the administration?

This report shows that under the wide-open program such as that advocated by Secretary Benson, wheat prices would drop to 90 cents a bushel, corn to 80 cents a bushel, rice to $3 per 100 pounds, cotton to 25 cents a pound, hogs to $11.20 per 100 pounds, and beef cattle to $15 per 100 pounds. These are the estimates of the Department of Agriculture. The advisory committee in reviewing them concluded that the average level of farm prices in the Department report is somewhat higher than is consistent with the estimated volume of marketings.

In other words these price and income estimates which I have been quoting probably would prove to be on the high side if the Secretary were to put his most recent programs into operation.

I hope that all the people of the United States will read this report carefully.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I have before me an article from the U.S. News & World Report, dated December 14, 1959, which shows, as does the report the Senator has just presented, the effect on farm prices by 1962 and 1963, if there was no farm program. As the Senator has just stated, according to this study prices would drop even further—wheat to 74 cents a bushel, beef cattle to 11.51 cents a pound, and so forth.

This U.S. News & World Report article entitled "If the Government Gets Out of Farming"—refers to the work and studies of farm economists at Iowa State University.

I congratulate the authority on agricultural matters in the Senate, the distinguished chairman of our committee, for his very fine presentation today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the report contained in the December 14, 1959, issue of U.S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF GOVERNMENT GETS OUT OF FARMING

(In spite of billions spent supporting farm prices, farmers' purchasing power now is the lowest in 19 years. Would farmers do better without Government help? Look at this study from the heart of the corn belt.)

AMES, IOWA—This idea keeps popping up: Why not get the Government out of farming and let farm prices find their own level in a free market?

What would happen then? A study just completed by farm economists at Iowa State University attempts to answer that question.

The answer this study comes up with: There would be further, drastic declines in prices of farm products.

The table on this page shows you, commodity by commodity, the level of prices that the Iowa State economists would look for within 3 years if Government price supports and crop controls were removed.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, in its latest price report, showed the level of prices for farm products at this time to be lower in relation to the prices that farmers pay for things they buy than at any previous time in 19 years. In others words, the purchasing power of a unit of farm products is less than at any time since 1940. That is the case in spite of Government price supports now in effect.

If price supports and crop controls are taken off, the study carried out at Iowa State University indicates that the following things would happen, assuming that surpluses now on hand are frozen and held off the market:

Grains: The bottom would drop out of the markets for wheat and corn. The price of corn, assuming normal weather in 1960, would drop down to 79 cents a bushel during the 1960–61 marketing year. The following year it would drop to 77 cents a bushel, and, in the 1962–63 marketing year, corn price would be down to 66 cents a bushel—lowest since 1940. Estimated average corn price for the current marketing year is $1.06 a bushel.

The study assumes that the 1960 wheat crop, much of which already is planted, would be sold with the market propped by price supports. So the first big drop in wheat prices would come with the 1961 crop. That year, the average price would drop to 90 cents a bushel, compared to the $1.71 a bushel estimated for the current year. Average price for the 1962 crop would sink to 74 cents a bushel, lowest since 1940.

Livestock: Price declines in these grains would result in great increases in the production of livestock. Wheat would join corn as a grain widely used to feed livestock and poultry. It is axiomatic among farmers that cheap feed means lower prices for livestock.

The market for beef cattle would hold up fairly well in 1960. By 1961, however, cattle prices would be dropping sharply. The average for the 1961–62 marketing year, without supports, is projected at $14.99 a hundredweight. In 1962–63, cattle prices would drop on down to $11.51 a hundredweight, just about half the average of $21.60 estimated for this year.

A reason given for the steep slide in cattle prices is that farmers now have a record number of cattle and calves on hand, and, with cheap feed, would put large supplies of beef on the market.

Hog prices would improve slightly in the 1960–61 marketing year. Then they would start dropping, reaching an average of $10.80 a hundredweight for 1962–63. That is 25 to 30 percent under present prices.

Milk, poultry, and eggs: Starting at the estimated average of $3.91 a hundredweight for the current year, milk prices would drop to $3.65 in 1960–61, to $3.42 in 1961–62, and to $2.66 in 1962–63. As shown in the table, prices for chickens, for turkeys and for eggs also would move downward over the 3-year period.

The Iowa State University economists emphasize that their study is not to be taken as a prediction of production and prices. Their projections, they state, "are the result of working through the implications of utilizing all grain that probably would be produced with no crop controls and average weather during the 1960 to 1963 period."

It was assumed that U.S. population would increase at the rate of 2.7 to 2.8 million a year during the period of the study and that per capita income would continue to rise.

Farm prices without supports: 74-cent wheat, 66-cent corn?

A forecast of how farm prices would drop if Federal price supports and crop controls were ended is given in an Iowa State University study, as follows:

	Prices now [1]	Estimated prices by 1962–63
Wheat, per bushel	$1.71	$0.74
Corn, per bushel	1.06	.66
Cotton, per pound	.315	.21
Beef cattle, per 100 pounds	21.60	11.51
Hogs, per 100 pounds	13.42	10.80
Milk, per 100 pounds	3.91	2.66
Eggs, per dozen	.327	.272
Broiler chickens, per pound	.167	.130
Turkeys, per pound	.221	.165
Lambs, per 100 pounds	18.62	15.13

[1] Averages, estimated for the 1959–60 marketing year.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON EXECUTIVE I, 86–1, AGREEMENT ON THE IMPORTATION OF EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL MATERIALS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Foreign Relations, on January 26 at 10:30 a.m., in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, will hold a public hearing on Executive I, 86th Congress, 1st session, the agreement on the importation of educational, scientific, and cultural materials. This agreement, often referred to as the Florence Convention, was signed in behalf of the United States on June 24, 1959, and was transmitted to the Senate by the President on August 25, 1959. While designed to promote education, science, and cultural interchange, the proposed agreement essentially has the form of a tariff and trade measure.

All those wishing to present testimony regarding this agreement should contact the chief clerk of the committee without delay.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address on the subject "Let's Help the Small Tobacco Farmer," by Representative KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia, before the Tobacco Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture, January 14, 1960.

Also correspondence between Joe R. Williams, Director of the Commodity Stabilization Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and Senator RANDOLPH.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

Correspondence with William B. Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, in regard to hiring policies of the Arabian American Oil Co., in New York State.

COMMISSIONER DOMINY DISCUSSES WATER AND PEOPLE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, while we carry out our day-to-day duties in Congress in representing our constituents, we are in contact with the many different agencies, bureaus, and departments of the Federal Government. Despite the fact the executive is controlled by the opposition, I have received excellent cooperation from many, especially the Bureau of Reclamation. This Agency is of vital importance to Montana, because of its many activities in the State.

Commissioner Floyd Dominy has done a fine job in administering this bureau. Both he and the Secretary of the Interior, Fred Seaton, have been most helpful in developing the resources of our State; and they are to be commended. Much of this development has centered around the State's water resources, and water is the key to much of Montana's future.

It was the subject of water and people to which Commissioner Dominy directed the attention of the Great Falls (Mont.) Chamber of Commerce, several days ago. On January 11, when he spoke to this civic group, he outlined the important role that reclamation plays in the growth of Montana, and he placed particular emphasis on water and people as our two important resources. This is a thesis with which I am in complete agreement.

Mr. Dominy is well known in Montana as a friend. He is a resident of our neighboring State of Wyoming. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have his speech of January 11, and also an editorial from the January 13 issue of the Great Falls Tribune, printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Also, I ask that a letter on this matter, addressed to the Secretary of the Interior by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator

from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech, editorial, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY COMMISSIONER OF RECLAMATION FLOYD E. DOMINY, BEFORE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AT GREAT FALLS, MONT., JANUARY 11, 1960

I am honored indeed in addressing the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce here tonight. It is always a pleasure and privilege to come to Montana, but under the circumstances of several previous visits in recent months, it is a distinct and signal honor to be invited back. I only hope I am not wearing out my welcome.

I enjoy these meetings with you folks, I consider them part of my job—a very important part—and I assure you that the business of reclamation is so broad and complex that even in four tries we are not going to get everything said on the subject.

It is possible that some of you were present at Sidney last summer when we celebrated the golden anniversary of the lower Yellowstone project and reviewed the accomplishment and far-reaching influence of that oldtimer among reclamation developments.

Others among you were with me in August at Helena when we talked about the physical accomplishments of that growing teenager—the Missouri River Basin project.

The trilogy was completed at Butte in November when we talked about the impact of the entire water resource program on the people it is designed to serve.

Tonight I ask that we look at the basic ingredients of this program—water and people—and consider the future of Montana in the light of some implications which we can draw.

Montana sits astride the Continental Divide. As is the case with all the States along the backbone of the Rockies, Montana is a producer and exporter of water. She is an importer too, primarily from Wyoming on the south and Canada on the north.

Water leaves the State principally near the two northern corners, in the Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers on the east, and the Clark Fork and Kootenai Rivers on the west. These are all very respectable streams.

It was a surprise to me, though it probably will not be to you, to learn that the Missouri, as it leaves Montana, is the smallest of the four. It discharges on the average about 6.4 million acre-feet annually. The Yellowstone contributes about 8.6 million acre-feet annually on the average. These two, combined into the Missouri River are just slightly smaller than the Clark Fork River, which has an average annual flow of 15.2 million acre-feet. The Kootenai River discharges an average of 9.9 million acre-feet annually, with much of the water originating in Canada. In total these four rivers carry about 40 million acre-feet of water away from Montana. By way of comparison that is roughly double the capacity of Fort Peck Reservoir.

It would appear to the casual observer that with this amount of water leaving the State, there should be plenty for all uses and there should be no serious competition for water within the State. As a matter of record this is not the case. Annual averages do not mean that the water will be available for any given year when and where needed and competition for water has been an integral part of Montana history. The first manifestation of this conflict was the outlaw ditch, by which water was put to use illegally in conflict with established rights.

The illegal competition was only a passing phase but soon more significant conflicts developed for which solutions were needed.

For example, in the middle thirties the Bureau of Reclamation was asked to investigate the possibility of developing a supplemental water supply for the Gallatin Valley, where serious water shortages developed. The studies were completed and showed that there was adequate water in the Gallatin River to supply the requirements, and that the water users could probably pay the cost of reservoir construction.

At this point, however, the potential development ran squarely into the established rights of the Montana Power Co. for its hydro powerplants on the Missouri. There was water enough, on an annual basis, for both uses, to be sure, but storing the spring runoff of the Gallatin for irrigation use would have made the powerplants short at certain seasons. Furthermore, this conflict was not restricted to the Gallatin Valley. It precluded any further water development on the Missouri River or its tributaries, above Fort Peck Reservoir.

As a result of the situation uncovered by this investigation, a study of the entire upper Missouri River area was commenced—particularly the area above the uppermost Missouri River plant of the Montana Power Co. The results of the investigation were incorporated into the plan for development of the Missouri River Basin, authorized in 1944 as the Missouri River Basin project.

The crux of the whole plan as far as Montana is concerned, was Canyon Ferry Dam and reservoir, which is now a reality. To many people Canyon Ferry Reservoir is a place to boat or fish; to some, the rising waters in the spring endanger the nesting geese; to others the drawdown period in the fall creates ugly mud flats; some see the power potential created, and the flood damage abated; others, the existing agriculture changed and production insured through irrigation.

Each of these observations and attitudes has some foundation in fact. No reservoir construction can have only a single effect, good or bad; all serve multiple functions with different emphasis. Canyon Ferry Reservoir provides flood control, power, some direct irrigation and municipal water supply, fish and wildlife conservation and recreation—just about everything in the book.

But having said all this we have still missed the real point of Canyon Ferry. Its principal benefit to Montana is that it permits development of the resources of the Missouri Basin both upstream and downstream in Montana, including a potential 170,000 acres of irrigated land, and the use of water for various purposes without interfering with prior rights. It is one of the most valuable river control structures in the State, a fact which is often overlooked. The development of the east bench unit near Dillon—now an integral part of our construction program—would not be possible without Canyon Ferry.

But lest you get the impression that Canyon Ferry is a panacea for all Montana's water ills, let me assure you that it is not. In the first place it affects only the Missouri; in the second place, when one conflict is resolved another usually crops up. This is natural in a dynamic society.

Let me continue the illustration with which I started—the Gallatin Valley. The overall plan of development approved by the Congress in 1944, under which Canyon Ferry Reservoir was built, also included a proposal for providing supplemental water for the Gallatin Valley and expanding irrigation there by diverting water from the Madison River. It was a carefully thought out plan, believed to best resolve the then evident conflicting demands on the river system.

However, when we began more detailed planning, real conflict became apparent in the Madison Basin. The Madison River is a blue ribbon fishing stream. Any suggestion of manipulating or controlling its waters met with vigorous protest. We do not object to such protests. They are one of the privileges of our democracy and one of the ways in which these conflicts are made known. We did, in this case, become concerned over some of the intemperate remarks based on inaccuracies which came into the picture. I am a fisherman myself, and last summer I managed to play hookey for a day of fishing on the Madison. Several nice trout and a grayling were in the creel at the close of the day. I left the stream only a day before it was dammed by nature without consulting anyone.

As a result of the high priority given to the fishery value of the Madison River, our suggested plan for developing the Three Forks area was modified. There will be only local use of the Madison, should conditions ever warrant, and greater use of the Jefferson and Gallatin Rivers in their respective basins. So here we are back at the Gallatin Valley again.

When we made plans for storage at the Spanish Creek site in the 1930's, no question was raised about fish and wildlife conservation. When we studied the same proposition in the 1950's, these conservation values had become of such consequence as to be a major factor in the decision to place storage in a deferred category and not include it in the proposed plan of development.

The implications of this situation are serious. Where conflicts of this magnitude exist some way must be found to reconcile the conflict through compromise, or a choice must be made. Sometimes both processes are used. In the Jefferson River Basin we have been able to reach a compromise at Clark Canyon Reservoir on the Beaver Head River near Dillon, which is soon to go into construction, as a part of the East Bench unit of the Missouri River Basin project and a similar course seems practicable at Reichle Reservoir, on the Big Hole River, now in the detailed investigation stage.

Not everyone is satisfied with compromise, of course, because it always involves a retreat from a preferred and established position. Nevertheless, a compromise represents an important step in the democratic process of government and we bend our efforts to seeking the best compromise in the interests of the Government and the people it represents. In all cases, of course, the final arbitrator is the Congress, the direct representative of the people.

I have used an illustration involving a fishery problem because it is pertinent and carries through a full cycle. I don't want anyone to leave this gathering and report that the Commissioner of Reclamation is sniping at the conservation interests, because that is not the case. Conflict is represented in most of the potential purposes and benefits of multipurpose reclamation development, and it is one of our jobs to reach the most equitable solution.

Recreation in Montana is big business, and it is to a considerable extent dependent on wise use of water to maintain it. Similar groups such as yours constantly working to bring new industry to the State, and adequate supplies of water at reasonable cost will be one criterion of site selection. Your cities and towns are growing, and water supplies must keep pace. There are still hydroelectric power sites in the State, which can be developed economically. You have thousands of acres of land which will respond to irrigation.

The fact that 40 million acre-feet of water leave the State annually will not prevent conflicts among these uses within the States. That there will be conflicting demands beyond the borders of Montana is also a foregone conclusion. So far development of the Columbia and Missouri basins is not far

enough along to create a pinch, but the next few years may see some real problems developing.

These conflicts and problems will be affected by the decisions you make in Montana as to future development. There is a potential additional consumptive use of 2 million acre-feet of water annually for irrigation in the eastern part of Montana where most of the arable land lies. To the extent that this development takes place and the water is thus used, it will reduce the 15 million acre-feet leaving the State on the east and available for downstream use, and competition will be increased.

On the other hand, the regulation required in Montana to effect use of this water will be advantageous to all users, within and without the State, because the resulting flow will be more uniform. Similarly as other uses are developed which will not reduce the total flow leaving the State, they will serve to regulate the flows and make them more useful.

This situation also exists in the western part of the State but because opportunities for consumptive use of water are less and the total volume of water is much greater the net effect will be less pronounced.

I mentioned at the outset of these remarks that I planned to talk about two of Montana's most important resources, water and people. Thus far I have dealt only with water and the problems you face in future development. Now, what about people.

I have before me, unofficial population estimates for the last decade. They show that the West as a whole is the fastest growing area in the country and that only the Pacific States, Washington, Oregon, and California, exceed the Rocky Mountain States in population gains.

The Rocky Mountain States show a gain of 32 percent, up 1.6 million from 1950. Montana participated in this increase to the extent of 96,000 people, a gain of 16 percent over 1950. With such a steady increase, *should not* Montana be concerned with further development of its natural resources, particularly water, for water is the key which unlocks the treasure chest for further economic development and growth?

I say you should and must tie in the planning of water resources development with your planning for population and economic growth. Just because you have experienced some solid growth in the last decade is no reason to rest on your oars.

The new census will probably show a total national population of 180 million people. Within the next 20 years, this total is expected to go to 250 million and by 2010, we can expect it to double, probably ranging around 370 million.

The wide open spaces will feel the impact of this population growth and your State will be under constant pressure to find new economic opportunities for coming generations. You can take advantage of this future growth, indeed live up to the challenge and responsibility it offers only if you maintain a steady pace in development and utilization of your natural resources.

Thus as these pressures grow, as the competition for water becomes keener, there will be new conflicts both within and beyond the State boundaries. Because of them you have an obligation to the State and the Nation to insure that maximum effective use is made of the water you have. I emphasize that word maximum.

No longer can the status quo or personal preference or loud voices of special interest groups be the criterion of priority of development. No longer should a single purpose be permitted to block development which can be clearly demonstrated to provide greater multiple benefits. The stakes are too high in terms of Montana's total best interests.

Neither can the Bureau of Reclamation or any other Federal agency make the decision—nor do we want to. It is your problem—one to be resolved in the light of all available information—in an atmosphere of cool considered judgment—by the best talent you have.

I urge you to create a climate of open-minded public opinion and adequate machinery in your State government to study the facts, and weigh the consequences of the several alternatives. You will then be able to present a united front in support of the wisest use of the natural resources which have been entrusted to your care. No one can do more.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of Jan. 13, 1960]

MONTANA CANNOT AFFORD TO LAG IN WATER USE DEVELOPMENT

No stranger to the West is Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy. Reared on a Nebraska farm, a graduate of the University of Wyoming, and a former Wyoming county agent, his grass-roots acquaintance with life and growth problems in Montana and other Rocky Mountain States was clearly evident to the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce audience Monday evening.

"Water and People" was the subject of Dominy's talk—a combination which if properly brought to bear on Montana's great variety of natural resources will open up a vast wealth of new economic opportunities for today's and future generations in this "Land of the Shining Mountains."

Sitting astride the Continental Divide, Montana is a producer and exporter of water aplenty to supply all possible needs of agriculture, industry, recreation and resident use—current and future. Montana is also an importer of water, primarily from Wyoming on the south and Canada on the north.

As Dominy remarked, it would appear to the casual observer that, with the amount of water that leaves Montana and the amount that flows into the State, there should be no serious competition for water within the State. It is a matter of record, however, that competition for water has been an integral part of Montana history. We have become increasingly aware of that competition in recent years—competition not only between regions but also among the various uses. And as we grow in population and industry that competition will grow inside and beyond Montana.

Two things we must keep in mind with regard to this competition for water in and outside of Montana. We cannot afford to allow our use competition for water within the State to prevent its development in the best interests of all the people. And we cannot afford to lag in our statewide development program, or we will lose in the race with outside competitors while they gain prior rights to the water which arises in and flows unused from Montana.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1960.

Hon. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I want you to know that I was particularly pleased to read the speech made by your Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd Dominy before the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce on January 11. He stated the value of Canyon Ferry Dam and Reservoir to the Missouri Basin as succinctly as it has ever been put. I am sending copies of his speech to some interested newsmen in the area so that more Montanans may have an opportunity to read the Commissioner's statement about Canyon Ferry.

I was also pleased that your Commissioner emphasized that Montanans "have an obligation to the State and the Nation to insure that maximum effective use is made of the water you have." I hope this full development concept is reflected in the Department's report on S. 1226 which would authorize construction of a dam in the Clark Fork-Flathead Basin of western Montana.

With warm personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

GRANGE PLATFORM FOR 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we have heard a discussion this morning about a remedy in the agricultural situation. The remedy which has been spoken of may be a remedy or it may not be. I doubt very much whether there is any remedy, unless we can, first, curtail production and, second, get distribution.

I happen to have before me a statement about the program of the Grange. As Senators know, I am a member of the Grange, and I have been for a good many years. This program is taken from the National Grange Monthly, and it has no relation to a miracle. It contains a number of suggestions. It bears in mind, which I think is the important feature, the fact that practically every depression we have had has started in the farm areas.

If we start monkeying with farm receipts we shall be in trouble. The farmer is the only fellow in America who does not receive his equitable share of the consumer's dollar for what he produces. That is definite. I could cite a number of instances to prove it.

The real problem we face is how to get distribution.

It was my privilege yesterday to be at the White House, and was my privilege also to have a few words with the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. We are happy that he has recovered. He told me of a very interesting incident. He said, "Senator, you have been talking about adequate distribution. I want to tell you something. You know, we are educating the Japanese people to eat wheat and to drink milk, which they never did before. We have programs in that regard."

I was in that country myself, and saw that program in action. It seems to me that is the beginning of a solution to the farm problem, which is in the right direction.

Mr. President, as the Congress searches for a solution to our complex farm problems, we turn, as always, to the farmers, themselves, and farm organizations for constructive thinking on ways and means of assuring a healthy agriculture.

Unfortunately, it is not always possible to get agreement, even among those in agriculture, as to what is best for the farm economy. Nevertheless, we must continue to carefully examine the proposals emanating from farmers and their organizations in striving to find ways and means of preventing a further downtrend in farm income. According to USDA reports, purchasing power of the Wisconsin farmer's dollar has dropped almost to depression levels of a quarter century ago.

At its 93d annual convention, the National Grange—one of our great farm

organizations—outlined a farm program for 1960. The Grange said that it seeks:

(1) Parity of income for producers; (2) income from the sale of farm products—not from taxpayers; (3) a continued program of abundance; (4) increased producer bargaining power; (5) producer-managed marketing programs; and (6) an expanded expert program that would permit farmers to compete in world markets on the basis of quality and efficiency.

As a strong voice in agriculture, I believe the 1960 platform of the Grange merits the consideration of Congress.

Recently this platform, entitled "On This We Stand," was published in the National Grange Monthly, including programs which the Grange favors and opposes. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THIS WE STAND—A SUMMARY OF THE GRANGE PLATFORM FOR 1960 AS ADOPTED AT THE CONVENTION

The Grange favors—

Programs to provide increased producer bargaining power.

Orders and agreements to provide farmer control over the marketing of agricultural commodities.

Adequate appropriations for extension and research.

Priority for research relating to utilization and marketing of farm products.

More strict quality control over export wheat.

Increased duty on imported sheep and dressed lamb.

Meat grading program modifications necessary to eliminate undue hardships on producers, handlers, or consumers of meat.

A continuation of the conservation reserve program.

Adequate appropriations for Farmers Home Administration with special emphasis on tenant purchase program.

A continuation of the present tobacco program.

The school lunch and milk program.

Making surplus commodities available to county or State tax-supported institutions as well as to schools.

A continuation of present peanut program.

A continued use of the parity income formula philosophy.

Continuation of the sugar program.

A self-help dairy stabilization program.

Legislation protecting State and individual water rights from Federal preemption.

The continuing development of soil districts.

Increased emphasis on programs for upstream watershed protection.

Tax-exempted farmer contributions to a retirement program.

Official designation of ample supplies of foods as a security reserve.

Legislation permitting farmers to use a 5-year average in figuring income for tax purposes.

Appropriations from general U.S. fund—for completing authorized Federal highway program.

A uniform system of road signs, signals, and markers adopted by all States.

Farmer representation on Interstate Commerce Commission.

Coordinated piggy-back rail-truck service.

Continued private ownership of railroads.

Decisive immediate action to implement a sound and adequate rural civil defense program.

Classroom grouping according to potential ability of students.

Equalization of school support burden.

Establishment of additional junior colleges to meet needs of rural areas.

More adequate rural health facilities, including additional qualified personnel.

Accelerated research to develop pesticides less toxic to humans.

A continuation and fuller use of Public Law 480.

Where possible, the use of farm commodities in place of foreign aid dollars.

EXTENDING AND EXPANDING THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my colleagues will recall that a few days ago, on January 13, I introduced a bill, S. 2797, to extend and expand the special milk program.

As Senators know, the program has provided a great service in the direction of making healthful milk available to children in schools and in other nonprofit institutions, including summer camps, child-care centers, settlement houses, and similar institutions. During its lifetime the program, operated on a cost-sharing basis, has met with real enthusiasm.

Annually, the service has expanded from a modest beginning until in 1959 more than 81,000 institutions were participating in the program distributing about 2.2 billion half pints of milk to the children of the Nation.

Unfortunately, funds have again run short; consequently, the USDA has put out a directive that, as of March 1, the Federal contribution will be somewhat curtailed.

The action has resulted in a great deal of deep concern on the part of school and other officials of institutions operating such programs. Overall, these school and community leaders have made an outstanding effort to provide such service for the children of the community. A cutback in Federal participation now is expected to create real hardship—since, in many instances, milk is provided for children from low income or otherwise less fortunate groups. The action by congressional agricultural committees in scheduling early hearings for consideration of supplemental funds is most commendable.

To illustrate the deep concern with which cutbacks in the special milk program are viewed by our school officials and other leaders concerned with the program, I request unanimous consent to have additional messages relating to the need for supplemental funds to avoid cutbacks of the milk-distribution service printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION

Whereas the special milk program in Wisconsin has demonstrated its value in providing essential nutritional benefits to schoolchildren of the State; and

Whereas such program has provided a substantial and ready market for the abundant milk production of Wisconsin's dairy farms; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture has announced by amendment to regulations the reduction in reimbursement rates for milk served under the terms of the special milk program effective March 1, 1960; and

Whereas such reduction of one-half cent per half pint would tend to work a hardship on school districts and children participating in such program; and

Whereas school budgets and finances for the current year have been established and cannot be readily amended to provide for the additional funds which this action would require; and

Whereas this action would in itself tend to discourage the expansion of the special milk program in Wisconsin and deny the nutritional benefits of this worthy program to the many needy children of the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive board of the Wisconsin School Food Service Association do hereby resolve that the association go on record as opposing such action by the Secretary of Agriculture and requesting that the Representatives and Senators in Congress from Wisconsin initiate and support such legislation as would rescind the action taken by the Secretary of Agriculture and reinstate the prevailing rates of reimbursement for special milk, and that copies of this resolution be provided to Representatives and Senators from Wisconsin.

WISCONSIN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION,
R. W. FENSKE, *President*.

TWO RIVERS PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Two Rivers, Wis., January 18, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator from Wisconsin,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On November 11, 1959, the Secretary of Agriculture issued an amendment to his regulations governing the operation of the special milk program in which the rates of reimbursement are to be reduced by one-half cent per one-half pint of milk beginning March 1, 1960.

The objective of reimbursements for school lunch programs and milk programs is to aid in making it possible for all of our children to have at least one-half pint of milk per day. The present rate of reimbursement is pretty much guaranteed that even where there are several children in one family it has been possible for families to provide this cost.

It is our feeling that additional reimbursement funds should be forthcoming to provide milk for schoolchildren rather than to decrease the amount of reimbursement which could result in many of our children not being able to participate in the milk program.

Yours very truly,

H. G. KNUDTSON,
Superintendent.

GRANVILLE HIGH SCHOOL,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 18, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We who are involved in the school lunch program are very much disturbed by the recent amendment of November 11, 1959, by the Secretary of Agriculture concerning regulations governing the operation of the special milk program for which the rates of reimbursement are to be reduced by one-half cent per one-half pint of milk beginning March 1, 1960.

The school lunch program in our school district is probably as valuable as any of our curricular programs. We feel that without Government support at even a higher level than previously, the program will suffer.

I am, therefore, urging you to defeat or repeal this amendment made by the Secretary of Agriculture. We need your support desperately in what we feel is a very vital issue in the school lunch program.

Thank you very much for your support in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

D. J. MCDONELL,
Business Manager.

WAUKESHA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Waukesha, Wis., January 18, 1960.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It has just come to my attention that the Secretary of Agriculture issued an amendment on November 11, 1959, which states that our allowance on milk will be reduced one-half cent per one-half pint beginning March 1, 1960.

This poses a very serious problem for us, because at the present time we can sell our milk with the hot lunch program at 1 cent and milk without the lunch program at 2 cents. If the subsidy is reduced one-half cent, you can see that we will have to charge the children 1 cent more in each instance than we do now, since most children buy only half pints at a time.

If this is going to be a legal policy, that is one thing; however, if the subsidy is reduced for a temporary period and then is increased to normal again, it causes greater confusion and inconvenience at the local level.

I hope you will use your influence to bring about action that will leave the subsidy the same so that we are not forced into an embarrassing situation in local schools.

Cordially yours,

R. G. HEIN,
Superintendent.

PLYMOUTH JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 8,
Plymouth, Wis., January 18, 1960.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It has come to our attention that according to proposed regulations of the Department of Agriculture the reimbursement on the school milk program will be reduced by one-half cent per one-half pint beginning March 1, 1960.

I suppose it is the usual thing for people to raise a hue and cry whenever a Government subsidy of any kind is about to be discontinued or reduced. It does seem, however, that the reduction of the reimbursement on the school milk program involves more than the ordinary philosophy underlying a Government support program. We have in this consideration, it seems to me, the matter of health of our Nation's children as well as the program of reducing milk surpluses.

As I have discussed the school milk program with parents in our community, I have observed wholehearted endorsement of this particular Federal support program by people in both the city and county. Although the proposed reduction is small, it cannot help but result in a corresponding increase of cost for milk to the pupil, as the milk and lunch programs operate on as close to a just-break-even basis as possible. With an increase in price, it is rather evident that the consumption of milk by schoolchildren will decrease.

At a time when Congress is seriously considering additional school aids, it seems inconsistent to reduce an aid program which appears to be operating effectively and well accepted by the public.

In the interest of a working support program for agriculture, as well as an investment in the physical well-being of the children in this country, I urge that you exercise the influence of your membership in the Congress to restore the proposed cut in school milk subsidy to its present level.

Thanking you for your kind consideration of this matter, I remain,

Very truly yours,

ELDEN M. AMUNDSON,
Superintendent.

PLAINFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Plainfield, Wis., January 18, 1960.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: Funds for the school lunch milk program are running out and the State informs us that there will be a cutback if Congress doesn't act at once. The health of our young people is our frontline of defense. I know how you stand on this vital issue but we again need your leadership to get something done at once.

There are bills up to construct classrooms with Federal funds. What we need is a place where we can borrow money at 3 percent interest to build our own classrooms. There is enough Federal money wasted to take care of both these programs.

Regarding your letter of December 10, 1958, "When the 86th Congress convenes, I shall introduce legislation aimed at increasing the allowable extra earnings from $1,200 to $1,800 a year" (social security). Social security was not set up to provide a living; $1,200 annually is unrealistic and should be changed at once. Best regards and a Happy New Year.

Sincerely,

C. S. PICKERING.

PLATTEVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Platteville, Wis., January 18, 1960.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has come to our attention that, as of March 1, reimbursement for the special milk program in the school lunch program is going to be reduced by one-half cent per one-half pint.

The school lunch and school milk programs have been of very definite benefit to the schools, not only in this community, but throughout the State and Nation. Children are getting milk and lunches where previously they were unable to get them due to the economic conditions of the family at home. In order that we may distribute milk and lunches to all who need them, it has been necessary to keep costs to an absolute minimum and, in some cases, provide free lunches or free milk where the child was unable to pay for the same.

With this anticipated reduction in Federal reimbursement, it will be necessary for us to do one of two things. We must either increase the price that we charge the individual child, or the additional cost will have to be absorbed by the school district and become an increased burden on the local property tax.

I would like to take this opportunity to request you and your office to do what you can to try to get the reimbursement reinstated, or take whatever other measures are necessary to avoid shifting this additional cost to the local taxpayer. We are very much afraid, in fact, in some cases we are positive that if we raise the price, the number of children participating will definitely be reduced.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. DIMICK,
Superintendent.

BOARD OF EDUCATION,
OCONTO FALLS PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Oconto Falls, Wis., January 18, 1960.
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We, the board of education of Oconto Falls, request your support in taking action to continue the existing rates of reimbursement for the special school milk program.

Thank you in advance.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY WOLF,
JOSEPH PORTER,
WINONA DOBRATZ,
HOWARD LEHNER,
STERLING BAUMAN,
AARON RUDOLPH,
HERB BRAUN,
Board of Education.

UPLIFTING TELEVISION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, of all mass media of communications television is the most popular and most powerful. It is the easiest to turn on, it is the most difficult to turn off. It has special appeal to our children and youth because it is dramatic, and combines pictures with words. I believe that some of the sociologists undertaking all kinds of remote and exotic studies would do well to examine a problem in our midst—the impact of television and television philosophies and morals on American youth.

Television presents a tremendous power, which can be either properly used—or else misused. All reasonable efforts must, therefore, be made to maintain it on a level which produces public benefit rather than waste and harm. This, however, is most difficult to accomplish due to the fact that advertisers desire large television audiences and will sponsor programs that appeal to the largest mass of people, without regard to their cultural, moral, or social value.

The public interest in radio and television is demonstrated by the fact that these instruments of mass media are public controlled and government owned in many countries—including Britain, where the BBC is a government-controlled system.

Naturally, we believe in freedom of speech and expression in this country, and have thought it advisable to leave radio and television to the management and competition of free enterprise. Yet, this does not relieve those responsible for American radio and television from discharging their public duty. This they have not always done well—much too often they have imposed on the public programs which appeal to the lowest common denominator of the viewing audience.

How to achieve a higher standard of radio and television without the necessity of Government control is a question not easily answered. Recently, however, Chairman John C. Doerfer, of the Federal Communications Commission, has suggested one way in which television can be upgraded without any control by the FCC over programing. He would have each network and its affiliated stations devote a preferred hour, for 1 week each, to cultural and educational programs. The next week another network would take its turn at presenting upgraded programs. These cultural programs, that the audience will see on the local station, would be divided between network originated programs and locally produced informational or cultural programs.

I believe that Chairman Doerfer should be highly commended for this excellent proposal. He appears to me to provide a solution in the American way—in which Government control is kept to a minimum, while the interested parties are required to show a higher degree of self-restraint and public responsibility.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from today's Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Upgrading

Television." It is time the television industry recognized more fully its public duty, because, in the words of the Washington Post and Times Herald, "The possibilities for making television a more useful tool of communication remain enormous."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UPGRADING TV

Chairman John C. Doerfer, of the Federal Communications Commission, has suggested one way in which television can be upgraded without any control by the FCC over programing. He would have one network and its affiliated stations carry cultural or educational programs each evening at a preferred hour for 1 week. Presumably the specified half hour would be given to network programs several evenings during the week and to locally produced informational or cultural programs on the other evenings. The next week another network would take its turn at presenting upgraded programs during the same half hour. The net result would be that educational programs would be available at a fixed time on one network or another every evening.

The plan has had a good reception among the broadcasters and it seems to have very promising possibilities. No doubt the individual stations will need a good deal of flexibility in substituting cultural programs of their own for what the networks may offer, but that would not neecssarily detract from the virtues of the plan. If the television industry takes the hint from the FCC Chairman and finds ready acceptance of a "cultural half hour," the next step might well be the development of a "public affairs half hour" worked out on a similar rotating basis. The possibilities for making television a more useful tool of communications remain enormous.

SECRETARY BENSON STANDS UP FOR JUSTICE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a recent editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer contains a fine tribute to one of our truly dedicated public officials, Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Benson.

It is gratifying to me that Secretary Benson continues to fight to relieve the American taxpayer from the mounting costs of farm subsidies and overstuffed granaries—for the good of the farmer and our economy in general.

I request unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec. 16, 1959]

SECRETARY BENSON STANDS UP FOR JUSTICE

Regardless of the political storms that follow Secretary Benson's every move—and will continue to do so in the 1960 election year—he stands out as a man who never fails to rise above partisan attack and continues to advocate what he believes to be in the best interests of the country as a whole.

Governor Rockefeller of New York spoke forcefully in defense of Mr. Benson—and justifiably so, we believe—in denouncing those who would make the Secretary of Agriculture a scapegoat for the multitude of economic ills that plague the farmers of America.

Rockefeller outlined a possible solution to the farm problem—one of many such proposals that have and will be presented and should receive careful study by Congress next year.

The farmers' troubles started long before Benson arrived on the scene. He has done his best, against formidable opposition, to free the farmers from the yoke of Federal controls and free all taxpayers—rural and urban—from the oppressive cost of farm subsidies.

Philadelphians and other city dwellers have good reason to give thanks to Mr. Benson. They pay not only a large share of the subsidy costs but higher food prices that result from the Federal farm program.

With the Government's stockpile of surplus crops now in excess of $9,200 million and expected to reach the $10 billion mark by early next year, it seems to us that Secretary Benson is absolutely right in demanding new legislation to reverse the present trend of ever-larger crop surpluses and constantly rising farm subsidies.

Mr. Benson's stand for what is right and just—regardless of political considerations—deserves greater appreciation and applause from the public than has been heard thus far.

We liked his reply when asked about rumors that he might resign.

"Resign? I am resigned to one thing—to do my duty as I see it."

Secretary Benson should stick to his guns. It will not be easy. But standing up for what is right, instead of what is expedient, never is.

REVIEW OF RECORD OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, 7 years ago, on a wintry day in January, a large assemblage of the American people gathered to hear the new President of the United States deliver a message, the essence of which was that he intended to be guided by a single precept, namely, what is good for all America.

He sent up a little prayer to heaven, for divine guidance in the pursuit of his dedication to his task. On that day, when he and his youthful and well-trained Vice President took the oath of office, I assume that the American people wanted, during the ensuing 7 years and thereafter, to believe that when we should arrive at this day in January 1960, they might be living in a nation which is at peace; that they might be living in a republic which has prospered, and which would have grown in those 7 years, in national wealth and savings, and in the personal welfare of individual Americans.

I believe that as they listened to the distinguished and beloved new President of the United States, they must have wished that the Government would accept and respect its responsibilities, and would accept and live up to the concept that the individual, the local community, and the State also have obligations which they must be prepared to assume in the interest of the only true liberalism, the freedom and dignity of the human individual; and that the Government and the people would effect a working partnership under the guidance of this administration to achieve that end.

It is a very happy day, in this happy land of ours, when, 7 years later, the dreams and aspirations of the American people are, in fact, realized; that indeed, as the people hoped that day, we are living in a land at peace; that indeed we are living in a land where progress goes hand in hand with the development of the individual's aspirations and the continuing recognition by the Government of the need for restraint, discipline, good housekeeping, thrift, and care in the handling of the revenues which it receives from our people.

After 7 years, it can certainly be said that that President and his administration have kept the faith. They have deserved well of the Republic. One evidence of that, among others, is the announcement in the press yesterday that 71 percent of the people approve of this President and of his course of conduct as the chief of the administration, and only 17 percent think otherwise.

We have heard also during these years that our rate of growth has put us behind the Soviet Union; that our rate of growth is only 3 percent, and that the rate of growth of the Soviet Union is 8 percent. Those same people have not bothered to tell their constituents or their listeners that 3 percent of the American prosperity is much greater, in dollars and in goods and good living, than 8 percent of the Soviet equivalent. But I am sure they will be either pleased or discomfited—according to their several natures—to know that when the budget was submitted by the President the other day, the rate of growth for the past year was shown to be not 3 percent, but 6 percent. While we were ahead of the Soviet Union then, in total results achieved, we have now doubled the rate of growth which we were accused of having in earlier years.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my good friend from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am grateful that the Senator has called attention to this date when President Eisenhower enters upon his final year as our Chief Executive. In his time of service the President has in the truest sense presided over the growth and greatness of our Nation.

We should be especially mindful, on the occasion of this milestone date, of the historic contribution the President has made to world understanding by his journeys to the hearts of men, by his unremitting efforts to project the true image and the true meaning of America to the peoples of foreign lands. Through his inspired efforts, he has torn away the false curtain of propaganda, he has made peace a living word of hope, he has held out the hand of friendship and felt its warm clasp in return.

As he enters his final year in office, the President stands as a global symbol of peace and friendship. We can be sure he will meet the great events and great challenges of the months to come with the same high spirit of dedication that has marked the past years of his office. May we join in wishing him Godspeed on this epochal day.

I am grateful to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania for permitting me to join him in these remarks.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York. I conclude by saying that the true test of effective leadership is to be found in the judgment of the people. The people of this country have unfailingly today in very great numbers indicated their respect and trust and confidence in that kind of leadership, and have shown that they want to have continued that leadership, which will engender trust, faith, and confidence. It is significant to note that the President has been judged the Man of the Decade from among all the world's leaders. The judgment of the world and the judgment of the people of this country is that we have a good, strong, devoted, faithful, and effective leader. He has been ably supported in his leadership by his administration, by you, sir, Mr. President, and by all those who have the responsibility and obligation of Government resting on them.

FEDERAL REGISTRARS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the decision of the Committee on Rules and Administration, announced this morning, to terminate its hearings on the proposed Federal registrar bills on or before February 5, is good news for all who wish to see real progress in the field of civil rights.

The timely ending of these hearings will insure orderly consideration of civil rights proposals at this session of the Senate. It is my intention as soon as the committee reports a Federal registrar bill to the Senate to offer a comprehensive amendment which will include all seven planks in the President's program plus a provision which will give the Attorney General the right to bring civil injunctive suits in all equal protection cases. This will permit the entire subject of civil rights to be placed before the Senate in a manner which should satisfy even the most sticklish parliamentarian. And it will make possible fulfillment of the promise of a Senate civil rights debate starting February 15 regardless of any action in the House of Representatives or inaction by the Committee on the Judiciary.

None of the bills dealing with Federal registrars which are presently before the committee is entirely satisfactory to me in every detail, although I support the general principle of these bills. I am confident that an effective registrars bill will be drafted in committee which will command the support of the majority of the members of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. President, in my judgment the action of the committee this morning is an insurance policy against any possibility that consideration of civil rights legislation will be delayed because the other body may not have acted and may not have sent a bill to us before February 15.

THE MEANING OF THE DILLON PLAN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there appears in today's issue of the New York Times an article captioned "Foreign Affairs—the Meaning of the Dillon Plan." The article was written by Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, and bears a London dateline.

Again I call the attention of the Senate to this plan; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, because I believe the Dillon plan is one of the most significant developments since World War II. By means of the Dillon plan, the United States now is seeking to obtain as partners, in connection with the giving of aid to less developed areas, the principal countries of the free world.

This matter is extremely important, for two reasons: First, we, alone, cannot do the job in an adequate way. That fact has been demonstrated in a practical manner, although we have done a great deal and have done a very fine job insofar as we have been able to proceed. Second, in the United Nations there are not sufficient funds to enable the doing of this job.

Therefore, Mr. President, the Dillon plan is the one to use in order to do the job—namely, use the NATO countries, and add to them Japan, Brazil, Australia, and other countries which can join in giving help.

Again I must report to the Senate that the initiative in this entire effort—commenced as far back as the fall of 1958, and continued in September, 1959—was taken by the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, to which the Congress adheres, and was taken primarily through its Economic Committee, of which I have the honor to be Chairman. I point out that development as one of the fruits of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference; and it is important that we do point out the very worthwhile fruits of that organization and similar organizations, inasmuch as we participate in the many activities of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, the Interparliamentary Union, the Council of Europe, and similar groups.

Mr. President, the initiative taken by the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, to which we adhere, and which we help support, is worth manyfold, incalculably more, than all that we have spent in time and effort in supporting that organization, and even if we lump together our contributions to all the parliamentary organizations to which we adhere. I believe the Dillon plan is one development by means of which that work has borne extremely fine fruit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—THE MEANING OF THE DILLON PLAN

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

LONDON.—The United States has now accepted the Soviet challenge to an era of competitive coexistence during which there will be increasing emphasis on an economic contest to win the ideological allegiance of underdeveloped lands. This is the real meaning of the developing policy known unofficially in Europe as the Dillon plan.

The decade of the fifties, dominated by the growth of NATO and the anti-NATO Warsaw Pact, was marked by military rivalry between the Communists and the West. The decade of the sixties will almost surely be marked by a similar economic rivalry if the balance of armed strength can be maintained.

Under the Dillon plan, which is only beginning to take shape, the following new departures may be discerned in our policy. We seek to unite the two European trading blocs, North America and Japan in a single organization to coordinate overseas economic aid.

We are quashing an incipient trade war between the European blocs before it can damage Western unity or hurt U.S. commercial interests. And, for the first time, we hope to harness Japan's industry in tandem with that of the West to help backward nations.

This program is a logical successor to the Marshall plan, which put Europe back on its feet. The Marshall plan served as the bony structure upon which NATO was built and also aspired to provide the framework for West European unity. There it failed. Europe split into a continental bloc led by France and West Germany, known as the Inner Six, and a peripheral bloc, known as the Outer Seven and led by Britain, concerned with its Commonwealth interests.

Washington intends to prevent this division from maturing into a political schism that would weaken NATO. It also intends to insure that any arrangements between the Six and Seven are not prejudicial to us. Furthermore, it hopes to join both groups with all other free industrial nations in a program to assist poor lands.

Rich countries have been getting richer and poor countries poorer. Therefore, Africa and Asia need emergency help to avoid eventual chaos. The raw materials, potential markets, and strategic location of these lands make it essential for us to keep them from Communist control.

Inside our administration there has been discussion on the best way to meet the challenge. Some advocated a global aid program in which the free and Communist worlds would work together under the U.N. It has now been decided to reject that idea.

An era of frankly competitive coexistence is therefore accepted with our own and the Soviet coalition each determined to make political and propaganda capital out of eleemosynary efforts. The U.N.'s special programs will clearly be relegated to a subordinate role.

The Dillon plan was developed by the Under Secretary of State after his return from a GATT conference in Toyko last October. Simultaneously Sir Oliver Franks, British economist and former Ambassador to Washington, and Jean Monnet, French economist, were elaborating similar approaches.

Since last month's Western summit meeting the Six and the Seven, without really burying their dispute, have at least agreed to work together, where possible, to curb threats of discrimination against each other and against us, and to join in the overall aid program. Shortly they will accept Tokyo's partnership.

The new organization to be created will therefore be on a free world rather than an Atlantic basis. But the United States and other prospective members expect to name as delegates to it their present envoys to NATO, thus insuring good economic liaison with the latter.

The logic behind the Dillon plan is simple. The United States helped restore prosperity to Europe and Japan. Now it is time for them to join North America in a similar endeavor elsewhere. The war against pov-

erty and confusion is being fought on vast battlefields. Our goal is not only to hoist underprivileged peoples by the bootstraps but to insure them against communism.

This is an infinitely long-range task, likely to endure the rest of this century. Fortunately, and thanks no little bit to the prod of Russia's own increasingly effective aid program, the job has now begun. And fortunately, also, the United States has again begun to assert positive diplomatic leadership.

BETTER CITIZEN UNDERSTANDING OF THE TRUE COST OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is unfortunately true that far too many of our people do not know the fiscal picture of our Government. There is one time during the year, however, when almost every one of us thinks about the situation; that is when we figure our income taxes.

There has come to my attention an excellent concise "Fiscal Report to Each Taxpayer in Maryland," prepared by Mr. Louis L. Goldstein, the comptroller of that State. It is published on inexpensive paper on a sheet, 8½ by 11 inches, folded three ways in order to fit in the envelope containing the State tax forms. Three sets of piegraphs are included; they are captioned "Where Your State's Money Came From"; "Where Your Money Went"; and "The State's Bonded Debt Account." I ask unanimous consent that the message on the front cover and the data in the piegraphs be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I believe that the Federal Government could well emulate the excellent job Maryland is doing in informing its citizens. While I have not had extensive research on the subject done, I imagine that other income tax States are doing this sort of thing, too.

I should like to suggest that Secretary of the Treasury Anderson look into the possibility that a brief report of this nature be prepared and sent to the taxpayers annually, when income tax forms are distributed. As of now, no fiscal report is made directly to our taxpaying citizens. I think one should be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the excerpts from the pamphlet were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FISCAL REPORT TO EACH TAXPAYER IN MARYLAND

We are pleased to submit to the people of Maryland this report on the money received and spent by the State during the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1959.

Few taxpayers have the time to familiarize themselves with the amount of money received by the State, nor do they realize how much is collected from each specific tax. Many people in Maryland may not be aware of the numerous services rendered by their State and the cost of such services.

It is our hope that the information contained in this folder will help you have a better understanding of the financial affairs of Maryland.

LOUIS L. GOLDSTEIN,
Comptroller.

Where your State's money came from, fiscal year ended June 30, 1959

INCLUDING BOND ISSUES, $452.5 MILLION

	Amount (millions)	Percent
Income taxes:		
Individuals	$81.6	18.02
Corporations	18.1	4.00
Total	99.7	22.02
Retail sales and use taxes	55.8	12.33
Motor vehicle fuel tax	51.0	11.26
Motor vehicle licenses, fines, titling tax	37.3	8.25
Property and franchise taxes	36.0	7.98
Tobacco, liquor, and racing taxes	34.8	7.69
Fees, service charges	25.0	5.51
State revenue	339.6	75.04
Bond issues:		
State of Maryland	16.8	3.72
State roads commission	27.7	6.12
Total	44.5	9.84
Federal grants:		
Highways	37.8	8.35
Welfare, health, conservation	30.6	6.77
Total	68.4	15.12

EXCLUDING BOND ISSUES, $408.0 MILLION

	Amount (millions)	Percent
Income taxes:		
Individuals	$81.6	20.00
Corporations	18.1	4.44
Total	99.7	24.44
Retail sales and use taxes	55.8	13.68
Motor vehicle fuel tax	51.0	12.50
Motor vehicle licenses, fines, and titling tax	37.3	9.14
Property and franchise taxes	36.0	8.82
Tobacco, liquor, and racing taxes	34.8	8.53
Fees, service charges	25.0	6.13
State revenue	339.6	83.24
Federal grants:		
Highways	37.8	9.26
Welfare, health, and conservation	30.6	7.50
Total	68.4	16.76

Where your money went, fiscal year ended June 30, 1959

INCLUDING DEBT RETIREMENT, $450.1 MILLION

	Amount (millions)	Percent
Highways:		
State roads	$92.7	20.59
Highway tax distributions to political subdivisions	31.1	6.90
Total	123.8	27.49
Education:		
School aid to political subdivisions	81.5	18.11
State programs	39.7	8.82
Total	121.2	26.93
Health and welfare:		
Health, hospitals, mental hygiene	37.7	8.38
Public welfare	29.0	6.45
Total	66.7	14.83
Legislative, judicial, general government	33.8	7.51
Land, buildings, equipment	21.4	4.75
Correction, public safety	17.4	3.87
Operation and maintenance	384.3	85.38
Debt service:		
Debt retirement	23.0	5.11
Interest	7.3	1.63
Total	30.3	6.74
Sundry taxes distributed to political subdivisions	35.5	7.88

Where your money went, fiscal year ended June 30, 1959—Continued

EXCLUDING DEBT RETIREMENT, $427.1 MILLION

	Amount (millions)	Percent
Highways:		
State roads	$92.7	21.70
Highway taxes distributed to political subdivisions	31.1	7.29
Total	123.8	28.99
Education:		
School aid to political subdivisions	81.5	19.08
State programs	39.7	9.30
Total	121.2	28.38
Health and welfare:		
Health hospitals, mental hygiene	37.7	8.83
Public welfare	29.0	6.79
Total	66.7	15.62
Legislative, judicial, general government	33.8	7.91
Lands, buildings, equipment	21.4	5.01
Correction, public safety	17.4	4.07
Operation and maintenance	384.3	89.98
Interest on public debt	7.3	1.71
Sundry taxes distributed to political subdivisions	35.5	8.31

The State's bonded debt account, including highway construction bonds, June 30, 1959

TOTAL OUTSTANDING, $395.8 MILLION

	Amount (millions)	Percent
Public school construction advances to political subdivisions	$80.2	20.26
Highway improvement	189.2	47.80
Buildings and equipment	126.4	31.94

BONDS AUTHORIZED FOR FUTURE ISSUANCE, $292.4 MILLION

	Amount (millions)	Percent
Public school construction advances to political subdivisions	$45.3	15.49
Highway improvement	195.0	66.69
Buildings and equipment	52.1	17.82

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HRUSKA in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC STRIKERS' VOTING RIGHTS UNDER TAFT-HARTLEY AMENDMENTS IN THE LABOR REFORM LAW

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of the Senate an address by James V. Constantine, Solicitor of the National Labor Relations Board, entitled "Economic Strikers' Voting Rights Under Taft-Hartley Amendments in the Labor Reform Law."

Mr. Constantine served the Labor Subcommittee and the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare as a technical adviser during the difficult days when

both groups were considering labor reform legislation. Jim contributed a great deal to our understanding of the Taft-Hartley law and to our comprehension of what proposed changes in the law would mean in terms of developments within the labor-management field.

Although Jim would be the last to admit it, he is an acknowledged expert on the operations of the National Labor Relations Board and the law it is empowered to administer.

In his address dealing with economic strikers, Jim views with objectivity the problems which face the Board and labor and management in coming to an understanding of the provisions affecting strikers not entitled to reinstatement.

So that every Member of Congress will have an opportunity to read his statement, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC STRIKERS' VOTING RIGHTS UNDER TAFT-HARTLEY AMENDMENTS IN THE LABOR REFORM LAW

(Address of James V. Constantine, Solicitor, National Labor Relations Board, at the Briefing Conference on Taft-Hartley Amendments in the Labor Reform Law, the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.)

The question of whether economic strikers should be permitted to vote in an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board has confronted the Board since its inception. At present, the matter appears to be regulated by section 702 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. This section amends the second sentence of section 9(c)(3) of the National Labor Act, as amended, to read as follows:

"Employees engaged in an economic strike who are not entitled to reinstatement shall be eligible to vote under such regulations as the Board shall find are consistent with the purposes and provisions of this Act in any election conducted within twelve months after the commencement of the strike."

The second sentence of 9(c)(3), prior to the 1959 amendment, read: "Employees on strike who are not entitled to reinstatement shall not be eligible to vote."

Section 603 of S. 1555 and its predecessor, section 604 of S. 505, as introduced and as reported by the Senate Labor Committee (S. Rept. No. 187, 86th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 4, 31–33, 56) would have deleted the second sentence of 9(c)(3). Such deletion was intended to allow permanently replaced economic strikers to vote. Identical treatment was accorded to the matter by both the Elliott and Shelley bills in the House. (See H.R. 8342, sec. 703; H.R. 8490, sec. 703; H.R. Rept. No. 741, p. 51.)

President Eisenhower also has attacked the problem of disfranchising the economic striker. In his 1952 campaign he characterized it as a "union busting" tactic. He mentioned it in a special labor message in 1954, and he denounced it in his labor message of 1958 to Congress—(S. Rept. No. 187, 86th Cong., 1st sess., p. 32). Finally, the administration's labor bill of 1959 provided for a repeal of the second sentence of section 9(c)(3). (See sec. 507, S. 743, 86th Cong., 1st sess; sec. 507, H.R. 3540, 86th Cong., 1st sess.)

Constitutional questions aside—see *Teamsters v. Leedom*, 37 LRRM 2791 (D.C.D.C.)—this one sentence amendment seems to be gravid with ambiguities. Resolution of such ambiguities with respect to the second sentence as it stood prior to the passage of the 1959 amendment was had by resorting to legislative history. *Union Mfg. Co. v. N.L.R.B.*, 221 F. 2d 532, 35 LRRM 2348 (C.A. D.C.). In addition, it would seem that the Board's past interpretations of language almost identical in the prior 9(c)(3), i.e., identical as to the words "employees on * * * strike who are not entitled to reinstatement," may command "great weight." See *Union Mfg. Co. v. N.L.R.B., supra*, 35 LRRM at 2351. Accordingly, it is proposed to discuss some of the more important problems likely to arise under the new amendment in the light of legislative history and prior Board decisions.

In its early days, the Board declared that only economic strikers were eligible to vote and excluded their replacements. *A. Sartorius & Co.*, 10 NLRB 493, 494. In Sartorius, the Board reasoned that if both strikers and replacements voted "possibly twice as many as can be employed may participate in the election. This was not the intent of Congress. Yet the intent that the strikers should remain employees for the purposes of the act is clear. By preserving to employees who go on strike their status as employees and the rights guaranteed by the act, the act contemplates that during the currency of a strike, the employer and the striking employees may settle the strike, with the striking employees returning to their former jobs, displacing individuals hired to fill these jobs during the strike. Strikes are commonly settled in this manner. The hold of individuals who, during the currency of a strike, occupy positions vacated by striking employees is notably tenuous. To accord such individuals, while the strike is still current, a voice in the selection of the bargaining representative of the employees * * * would be contrary to the purposes of the act and the ends contemplated by it" (10 NLRB at 494–495).

But the Mackay case (*N.L.R.B. v. Mackay Radio & Telegraph Co.*, 304 U.S. 333) caused the Board to revise its thinking on this subject. Since the Mackay case held that economic strikers who had been permanently replaced were not entitled to reinstatement, the Board concluded that the replacements should have a voice in the selection of a bargaining representative. Accordingly, both strikers and replacements were permitted to vote. *Rudolph Wurlitzer Co.*, 32 NLRB 163; *Columbia Pictures*, 64 NLRB 490. In 1947, the amendment to 9(c)(3) was enacted whereby the strikers could not vote if they were not entitled to reinstatement. The 1959 amendment controls the situation since November 13, 1959.

Several problems readily present themselves in administering the 1959 amendment.

1. Does section 702 require adoption of formal regulations pursuant to the rule-making process, or is the Board empowered to develop this branch of the law by adjudication, i.e., on a case-by-case basis? In this connection, Congressman Griffin's remarks do not seem helpful. His contribution in aid of the legislative intent consists of the observation that the Board may limit the right to vote "by regulations consistent with the purpose of the act." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 14, p. 18152.) Senator KENNEDY seems to think that the adjudication approach is proper. He concluded that the amended 9(c)(3) "would permit the NLRB to decide when and under what circumstances it would be desirable for economic strikers to vote" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 5, p. 6411). Senator CASE of South Dakota, who sponsored the amendment to 9(c)(3) as finally adopted, accepted Senator KENNEDY's remarks as stating the situation "well" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 5, p. 6533).

2. May employees who permanently replace economic strikers vote? On this the text of the new amendment is silent. If Sartorius is followed, the replacements cannot vote; if Wurlitzer is adopted, the replacements will be eligible to vote. Legislative history is uninformative. Board decisions since November 13, 1959, seem indecisive. These cases merely provide in stereotyped language that "employees engaged in an economic strike which began less than 12 months from the date of the election who have been permanently replaced and their replacements shall vote by challenged ballot," and "ineligible to vote are employees * * * engaged in an economic strike which commenced more than 12 months before the election date and who have been permanently replaced" (*Great A. & P.*, 125 NLRB No. 36; *Porto Rico Refinery*, 125 NLRB No. 45; *Thompson Weinman Co.*, 125 NLRB No. 32; *Florida Enterprises*, 125 NLRB No. 40). They do not decide the question of whether both strikers and replacements shall be eligible to vote, nor the question of what stage of the proceeding evidence relating to eligibility will be received.

3. Whether strike misconduct will render a striker ineligible to vote although he has not been discharged, replaced, or denied reinstatement by the employer. A preliminary question arises as to whether the conduct alleged to disqualify consists of violence or other nonpeaceful acts on the one hand, or nonviolent activities, such as wildcat strikes or strikes in violation of nonstrike clauses. It is possible that the Board may differentiate between violent and nonviolent conduct, denying the franchise to those who have engaged in one or the other conduct.

Assuming, however, that the Board will treat both cases alike, the question is whether misconduct by strikers will disqualify them from voting. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, the Board held that, absent a discharge or refusal to reinstate a striker for misconduct, he remained an employee whose right to vote had not been forfeited (*Union Mfg. Co.*, 101 NLRB 1028, at 1031). Expanding upon this generalization, the Board observed that "where no * * * discharge or denial (for conduct rendering strikers unsuitable for reemployment) of reinstatement takes place * * * or where it occurs after the date of the election has passed, the individual, as an employee whose status has not been altered or challenged as of the election date, is clearly entitled to vote" (101 NLRB at 1031. Union Mfg. Co., was approved by the District of Columbia Circuit, 221 F. 2d 572, 35 LRRM 2349).

4. Another problem which the Board will probably meet involves the question of whether the replacements are in fact permanent. It would seem that, absent other disqualifying conduct, an economic striker who has not been permanently replaced is entitled to reinstatement. At least this result flowed from the Board's reading of the Taft-Hartley Act. (See *Belmont Smelting & Refining Co.*, 115 NLRB 495.) But to ascertain whether a particular replacement is permanent involves criteria which Congress has failed to establish. It would seem that Board decisions under the Taft-Hartley Act, like Belmont Smelting, supra, and the *Pipe Machinery*, 79 NLRB 1322, 1326 and *Triangle Publications*, 80 NLRB 835, 836 (temporary replacements became permanent) should be relevant.

5. Another problem is to distinguish between economic strikers and unfair labor practice strikers, for the latter do not seem to be affected by the amendment to 9(c)(3). Unfair labor practice strikers have always been eligible to vote. *Times Square Corp.*, 79 NLRB 361, 364. An economic striker is not defined by either the amended statute or the legislative history accompanying it.

Under the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act an economic strike was described by the NLRB as "a strike not caused by unfair labor practices." *Columbia Pictures,* 64 NLRB 490, 491. It is probable that Congress intended to embrace this understanding of the term in the amendment to 9(c)(3), especially in view of the rule that reenactment of statutory language may indicate congressional agreement with the Board's practice thereunder. (See *N.L.R.B. v. Seven Up Bottling Co.,* 344 U.S. 344, 351.)

But the question is how to ascertain whether a strike has been caused by unfair labor practices or by economic considerations. Neither the new amendment nor its predecessor in the Taft-Hartley Act offers any suggestions or even a hint. Legislative history has neglected this aspect of the problem. Prior Board practices may be applicable. These practices follow:

The Board has stated that strikers are presumed to be economic unless they are found by the Board to be on strike over unfair labor practices of the employer (*Anchor Rome Mills,* 86 NLRB 1120, 1122). Prior to the 1947 amendments, the determination that a strike was caused by unfair labor practices was traditionally made by the Board in complaint cases. But since 1947, that is, under Taft-Hartley, the initial finding in a complaint case can be made only by the General Counsel. Hence a dismissal of a charge by the General Counsel will compel the Board to conclude, "without further examination of the facts," that the strike was economic (*Times Square Corp.,* 79 NLRB 361, 364–365). Accordingly, there has developed the doctrine that whether a strike is an unfair labor practice strike cannot be litigated, and that the determination of the General Counsel on a charge is dispositive (*Cooper Supply Co.,* 120 NLRB 1023).

6. Another problem which Congress has left unsolved relates to employees who strike in violation of section 8(d), i.e., those who strike "within the 60-day period specified" therein. If such persons are treated as are other strikers guilty of misconduct, then the rules relating to misconduct should have some hearing in this area. For a strike within the 60-day period may be assimilated to a wildcat strike or a strike in violation of a nonstrike clause. But section 8(d) enjoins the Board to find that an employee who "engages in a strike within the 60-day period specified * * * shall lose his status as an employee of the employer engaged in the particular labor dispute." Since such a striker has lost his status as an employee, will the Board allow him to vote?

7. Another phase of the problem apparently overlooked by Congress but which may haunt the Board concerns those strikers, even if not replaced, who do not have a reasonable expectancy of being recalled in the near future because of lack of business. Such strikers literally "are not entitled to reinstatement" within the meaning of the amended 9(c)(3). But will the Board permit them to vote? Under the Taft-Hartley Act, the Board denied such strikers the right to vote (*Plastic Molding,* 112 NLRB 179, 182; *Cuttingham Buick,* 112 NLRB 386). Whether such strikers will become eligible to vote under the 1959 amendment may depend upon whether the Board will apply the Plastic Molding principle to them.

Closely allied to this problem is the question of whether a position exists because of its permanent discontinuance for economic reasons. (See *Pipe Machinery,* 76 NLRB 297, 250.) This need not detain us at this point, for it presents no more than a question of fact. But the legal question centers around the problem of deciding whether such discontinuance causes a striker to lose his franchise. Congress has set no guidelines. The Board must decide, in the light of past practices and other relevant materials, whether a striker may vote after his job has been abolished for economic reasons. And if the Board determines that a job eliminated for economic reasons disfranchises a striker, the further question will arise as to what constitutes economic reasons. It would seem that not only loss of business is economic, but also changes in operating methods may be economic. In *Meridian Plastics,* 108 NLRB 203, 205, for example, subcontracting the work of the strikers was held to have constituted an economic elimination of jobs which rendered the strikers affected ineligible to vote.

8. A few minor problems may be grouped together for summary discussion. If a striker obtains permanent employment elsewhere, may he vote in an election of employees of his former employer while the strike still persists? Under Taft-Hartley such strikers could not vote (*Belmont Smelting & Refining,* 115 NLRB 495; *Union Mfg. Co.,* 102 NLRB 1626, 1627). Will a replacement be permitted to vote if he was hired after the refusal of an unconditional application by a striker to return? In the past, the Board has not permitted such replacements to vote (*Columbia Pictures,* 64 NLRB 490, 491). And is a strike considered economic when prohibited by section 8(b)(4)(D), i.e., a strike in aid of a jurisdictional dispute? *Columbia Pictures, supra,* seems to think it is economic. Must a State-conducted election, which the Board sometimes recognizes (see *T–H Products,* 113 NLRB 1246), conform to the amended section 9(c)(3) to be accorded validity by the Board?

9. Finally, a serious procedural problem must be surmounted. How will questions of fact be decided—by evidence introduced at the representation hearing or at the time of disposing of challenges following the hearing. In the past, the Board has permitted all factual aspects concerning the voting eligibility of economic strikers and their replacements to be fully developed at the hearing of a representation case. In such cases, the Board made findings on eligibility upon the record made at the hearing and did not permit the strikers and replacements to vote under challenge (*Mastic Tile Co.,* 112 NLRB No. 178; *Belmont Smelting & Refining,* 115 NLRB 495). But if the facts have not been developed at the hearing, it has been customary to allow both strikers and replacements to vote subject to challenge, leaving resolution of eligibility questions to the investigation of challenged ballots after the election (*Pipe Machinery,* 76 NLRB 247, 249).

Whether the Board adopts one or the other of the above procedures, or leaves it to the parties to pursue either, cannot be predicted. But it would seem that both avenues may be open, in which case the parties will decide at what stage of the proceeding to introduce evidence on eligibility.

From the foregoing it seems reasonable to conclude that the new section 9(c)(3) is loaded with ambiguities, and that many of them may not be rendered certain until Board decisions in litigated cases have been issued.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION CONCERNING CIVILIANS AND COURTS-MARTIAL

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, yesterday in my remarks in the Senate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 734–744, are included Monday's U.S. Supreme Court decisions holding that American military authorities lack constitutional power to try American civilians by courts-martial overseas in peacetime for noncapital offenses as well as for capital crimes.

Also included as a part of my remarks is a brief statement to the effect that there really is not a vast legal no man's land now as a result of the decisions, as some from time to time have said.

Mr. President, legal problems now exist. They are problems which I am sure we can solve.

I wish to say at this time, Mr. President, that I am engaged in drafting legislation, to be introduced in the near future, to try to clarify this portion of the law. I have asked both the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General of the United States for their views since they head the Departments directly affected. They are expected to consult with the Secretary of State

Surely, we must guarantee basic constitutional rights of Americans and we should be able to work out procedures—by international agreements and U.S. statutes, if necessary—to provide that Americans who are charged with and convicted of offenses shall be punished, no matter where in the world they commit their offenses; that discipline in connection with American military forces be maintained; and that support be effective for American defense operations outside continental limits of the United States.

The duty of the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, of which I am honored to be chairman, in its continuing study of civilians and courts-martial, is to examine legislative proposals on the subject to see if constitutional rights are adequately protected. This we will continue to do to the best of our ability. We will give all suggestions our careful consideration. We welcome all suggestions from Senators who have an interest in this subject and feel disposed to make contributions to its solution.

Accordingly, I call attention to an editorial entitled "Curb on Military Trials," published this morning in the Washington (D.C.) Post. The editorial suggests methods of dealing with the problem which are worthy of our attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include this editorial as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 20, 1960]

CURB ON MILITARY TRIALS

The only puzzling thing about the Supreme Court's latest pronouncement on the constitutional rights of civilians who accompany the Armed Forces abroad is the fact that it split the Court three ways. Fortunately, the majority held fast to the principle that four Justices had previously laid down in the second Covert case and further projected that principle into new situations. The essence of the decision is that Congress may not deprive American civilians abroad of their right to a trial with constitutional safeguards because they are in some way attached to the Armed Forces.

In its 1957 decision the Court upset the court-martial conviction of Clarice Covert for the murder of her husband, but Justices

Harlan and Frankfurter joined in that decision only because a capital offense was involved. This newspaper took the view at the time that no logical distinction could be drawn between capital and noncapital offenses so far as the constitutional right to a jury trial in a civilian court is concerned. We also surmised that "time will sustain the main thread of their opinion"—the opinion against all military trials of civilian offenders abroad. This is precisely what a majority of the Court has now done. It is interesting to note that all four of the current opinions upholding this view were written by Justice Clark, who had dissented when the issue first went before the Court.

The distinction that Justice Harlan continues to draw between capital and noncapital cases seems to us illusory. If such a distinction were accepted, the military could, as Justice Clark noted, try all civilian cases abroad in military courts by merely reducing the charges. We do not think the Bill of Rights was intended to allow any such latitude. When the Founding Fathers gave Congress authority "to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces," they meant those forces and not civilians who might follow them abroad.

It is equally difficult to follow the distinction drawn by Justices Whittaker and Stewart between civilian dependents "accompanying the Armed Forces" and civilian persons "serving with" or "employed by" the Armed Forces. To be sure, the employees are more essential to military operations than are dependents. But surely the controlling fact is that both are civilians. If Congress should deem it necessary for civilian employees to be under military discipline, it could put them in uniform.

Since the Court has invalidated the unconstitutional grant of authority to military courts to try civilians abroad, Congress will now have to act. In many instances crimes committed by American civilians in other countries can be dealt with by the courts of those countries. In other instances when the standards of justice are not comparable, perhaps diplomatic arrangements can be made to create American civilian tribunals for handling minor cases and to bring the more serious offenders to this country for trial. However difficult the problem may prove to be, we think the country will be glad to know that the rule against trial of civilians in military courts during peacetime is being rigidly applied.

COMMUNISM AND ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, evidence of Communist direction behind recent anti-Semitic acts in West Germany continues to roll in. Constantine Brown, the distinguished journalist, correctly analyzes the situation in his Washington Evening Star column of January 19.

Mr. Brown points out that the Communists have a vested interest in promoting atheism, and that in this particular instance "Mr. Khrushchev's tactics are not difficult to understand. He wants to create a strong sentiment against the German Republic in order to have a better chance to settle the Berlin question in keeping with his own plans and wishes."

Today's Chicago Tribune carries a news item entitled "Bonn Reports Proof Found of Reds' Plot." This report lends added weight to Mr. Brown's excellent column.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 19, 1960]

KREMLIN IMAGE IN ANTI-SEMITISM—PRANKSTERS IN OUTBREAKS BELIEVED USED BY REDS TO PRESSURE WEST ON BERLIN

(By Constantine Brown)

As various pieces of news and information are put together, it becomes clear that the anti-Semitic outbreaks of the last few weeks in the Western World are largely the work of the skillful international Communist apparatus.

There has been no physical attack against persons of the Jewish race and creed. For the time being, at least, the perpetrators of the outbreaks have confined their activities to painting the Hitler swastikas on synagogues and breaking windows of some houses, which happened, however, to be occupied by gentiles.

The swastika painting was not limited to Hebrew houses of worship but also involved Protestant and Catholic churches. This was interpreted by those who are looking into the situation to mean that the so-called pranksters got out of hand and in their ardor to serve the Communist cause they included Christian houses of worship as well.

Atheism does not differentiate between religions. Whenever communism takes over a country the churches and their servants are among the first and principal targets. Churches and synagogues and temples, priests, rabbis, and bonzes all suffer alike.

New political philosophies which manifest themselves by violence as in major revolutions cannot tolerate religion which contradicts their "rational" doctrines. Thus the church suffered as much as the nobility during the French Revolution in 1789. Similarly, since the Communist revolution in 1917, the countries which were taken over destroyed or closed thousands of churches and murdered tens of thousands of pastors, regardless of their creed.

The present outbreaks have a definite political character and are palpably different from those which occur in the heat of a major turmoil. There is evidence that they were inspired by Kremlin agents and executed by crackpots who served as tools. It is strange, indeed, it is pointed out, that a wave of anti-Semitism—as it is falsely described—should take place almost simultaneously in West Germany, Italy, France, and the United States.

Mr. Khrushchev's tactics are not difficult to understand. He wants to create a strong sentiment against the German Republic in order to have a better chance to settle the Berlin question in keeping with his own plans and wishes. And what better platform can he devise to gain to his side the sentiment of the free world for a Kremlin solution of Berlin than to revive the hate and fear of nazism in the hearts of the people of Western Europe and America?

That the Red czar is determined to renew his demands for his own solution of the Berlin question became obvious last week when he entertained the heads of the Western diplomatic missions to the Soviet Union at the Russian New Year celebration. There, after the usual toasts for relaxation of tensions were drunk, Mr. Khrushchev told the American, British, and French Ambassadors separately that he will not tolerate further stalling on the Berlin question, which must be settled according to his lights at the forthcoming summit meeting. He was truculent and aggressive.

The clamor that nazism is not dead in Germany has been one of Mr. Khrushchev's stock accusations against the West German Republic ever since he assumed absolute power in the Soviet Union. He has used it in an effort to disassociate Germany from the NATO and is using it now in expectation of creating a strong anti-German sentiment in the free world which would serve his own purposes of establishing the Communist hegemony in that vital sector of free Europe.

The hooliganism of a handful of crackpots who became unwittingly or otherwise the tools of his agents caused an uproar which may have been fatal to the policies of the free countries. At the same time, in order not to disturb the prospects for a relaxation of tension, little is being said in the West about continuous systematic anti-Semitism which has been endemic in Russia since the days of the czars and has been worsened during the regimes of Stalin and Khrushchev.

Anti-Semitism and Communists work hand in hand. Only the Communists know how to use the anti-Semites in the free world for their own political purposes.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 20, 1960]

BONN REPORTS PROOF FOUND OF REDS' PLOT—EXPOSES ANTI-JEWISH CAMPAIGN PLAN

BONN, January 19.—The Government asserted Tuesday that it now has proof that "Communist influences were behind the worldwide anti-Semitic incidents of recent weeks."

A Government spokesman said the arrests Monday night of three anti-Jewish slogan scrawlers at Lehrte, near Hannover, confirmed intelligence reports that had been in Government hands for some time.

The spokesman said the information in the reports, part of which was published Monday, said the central committee of the East German Socialist Unity (Communist) Party met last January to lay plans for anti-Semitic incidents to bring West Germany into disrepute.

AN ARSON ATTEMPT

Authorities pressing an investigation into whether East Germany is behind the current outbreak of swastika daubing and hate slogans also announced the arrest of a suspected neo-Nazi student in West Berlin.

An arson attempt on a synagogue in Amberg, northern Bavaria, last Saturday was disclosed. An oil-soaked doormat was set on fire in a woodshed at the synagogue but firemen quenched the blaze quickly.

The three persons arrested at Lehrte were caught in the act of painting the words "Jews get out" on the walls of houses in black ink. Kurt Thomas, 33; Kurt Blank, 25; and Wolfgang Hulitschke, 28, were said to have been carrying a hand-painted poster with the same words on it as well as a swastika.

AT YOUTH FESTIVAL

Police said Blank had taken part in the 1951 East Berlin Communist world youth festival and Hulitschke was arrested in 1951 while illegally trying to travel to East Germany for the festival.

Police in West Berlin announced the arrest of Wolfgang Solondz, 21, a member of the banned neo-Nazi National Youth of Germany organization. He is suspected of having links with East German Communist officials.

MINISTER TO STAY

Theodor Oberlaender, West Germany's controversial minister for refugee affairs, said Tuesday he has no intention of resigning.

The 55-year-old ex-Nazi's minister issued an official statement after the Hamburg newspaper Die Welt appeared with a story that Oberlaender—accused of participating in mass killings in German-occupied Poland in 1941—had given to understand he would leave Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's cabinet. Oberlaender repeatedly has denied the mass death charges.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO DR. FRANCIS E. TOWNSEND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I can congratulate Dr. Francis E. Townsend on reaching his 93d birthday. Not only is this an achievement in itself, but Dr. Townsend has devoted more than the past quarter-century to forwarding the program he founded and he is still going strong. The Townsend Clubs of America urge us to utilize the talents and abilities of our senior citizens. This is an important segment of our population too often forgotten. It is a shame to neglect these people, and to ignore the fine work they can contribute toward our national goals.

Thanks to spectacular advances in nutrition, medicine and public health, today there are 14 million Americans over age 65. These are the retirement years, the golden years, when men and women who have worked hard can settle down in dignity and peace. But far too often, many of our people are finding the "golden years" tarnished with sorrow, pain and poverty.

The problem of our elder citizens is in two areas—ill health and low income. I am pleased that the special Subcommittee on the Problems of the Aged and the Aging, headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] will continue its work on these problems.

Our most fitting tribute to Dr. Townsend on this occasion would be to give every attention to the urgency of this task. This has been his dedicated work in the past decades. I join in extending him my congratulations and best wishes on his 93d birthday. May he be blessed with continued good health, and happiness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], designated "1-13-60—D," proposing substitutes for certain subsections of the bill.

SOCIAL SECURITY SHOULD BE EXPANDED AND RETIREMENT PAYMENTS INCREASED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, 25 years ago next August the Congress overwhelmingly enacted the most humane and advanced social legislation in our Nation's history—the Social Security Act. This despite opposition of those who termed it "state socialism."

The man who proposed this legislation and whose signature placed it on the statute books is dead. This is one of the many imprints that Franklin D. Roosevelt has left upon the pages of history.

Today, under the beneficent provisions of this act, more than 72 million Americans, employed and self-employed, have assurance that in their old age they will enjoy a measure of security.

But, I regret to say, Mr. President, it is not enough.

America has never been a Nation content to stand still and rest on the laurels its great achievements have won. It has been our tradition and our history, rather, always to move forward. Always to take newer and ever greater steps in the interests of our Nation and its citizens.

This same tradition, I assert, must continue to be applied in the field of important social legislation.

Since passage of the Social Security Act of 1935, Congress has made changes in the act in keeping with fast-changing times. We have a duty to further expand and liberalize this program for the welfare of the Nation and its citizens.

It is my happy personal recollection that, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, I helped draft the present liberalized and expanded social security program.

However, in the decade just passed, the need for broader, more sweeping changes has outstripped our efforts to meet that need.

Our social security program today does not give enough protection to enough people. It has not kept pace with the times, nor has it kept pace with expanding needs of our elderly citizens.

When the Social Security Act became law, there were fewer than 7 million Americans 65 years old or older.

Today, there are nearly 16 million; and by 1975, many experts believe, there will be more than 20 million.

Because today most of our over-65 population have inadequate incomes, most do not receive private pensions, most cannot afford proper medical care, and many are ill-housed, it is clear that expansion on a broad level in social security must be made now to avoid a catastrophe of sweeping proportions among our aged in the future.

CRASH PROGRAM

Indeed, Mr. President, in this 25th anniversary year and in the 1st year of a new decade of challenge, the time has come for a major breakthrough, a crash program in social security.

Piecemeal, patchwork, and after-the-fact legislation have proved inadequate to meet the needs of America's elderly population. We must learn to anticipate needs, not get tangled in the confusion of interpreting them long after they have swept onto the scene.

Mr. President, this Nation no longer can afford to handicap its elderly with inadequate benefits and inadequate health protection while, at the same time, confining them to an unrealistic, unfair, and unnecessary earnings limit of $1,200 annually.

This limit must be raised to $3,000 to enable many of our older people to enjoy a decent American standard of living without adding extra burdens to the taxpayers.

This present limitation is not realistic. It imposes cruel financial punishment on persons still able to work after 65 and denies them a right they have earned by their own contributions into the social security fund. Their work and money have built this fund.

As a trial lawyer in Cleveland, Ohio, for many, many years, going into court day after day, trying personal injury and other lawsuits, I have, since 1935, seen the life expectancy of American citizens increase by leaps and bounds. Those of us who have experienced tragedy in our own families, as I have, and who have lost dear ones, know that medical science is on the brink of finding a cure for cancer. It is generally known that science also may soon discover how to prevent heart attacks in many cases, which, as Senators know, cause so many untimely deaths to men in their forties and fifties.

UNREALISTIC LIMIT

When those two things have been accomplished by our medical research, then, indeed, life expectancy will go higher and higher, and men and women of 65, 70, and 75 will have the ability to participate in gainful employment after retirement. So it is very unfair and very unrealistic to impose, as the present social security law does, a limit of $1,200 a year. Otherwise, a retired person may not receive the social security retirement payment for which he paid premiums during his active lifetime.

If there is no substantial increase in the earnings limit, the so-called soaring sixties will never leave the launching pad for millions of our elderly citizens.

But more than this is needed if we are to bring our social security program truly up to date in keeping with the expanding needs of our people.

Retirement benefits, which now average only $72 a month, should be increased by at least 10 percent; and the minimum benefit payment, now $33 a month, should be increased substantially. Because of present surplus and premiums constantly coming in, the program will remain actuarially sound. After all, there is now $22 billion in the social security reserve fund. That is $22 billion, not $22 million. So, without impairing the fund in any manner, Congress can certainly increase the retirement payments by at least 10 percent.

It is a fact that we have dealt unrealistically and unimaginatively with the problems of disabled workers.

Crippling disability is no less tragic at 30 than at 50. No less final in destroying the ability to work and earn a decent living.

Once a doctor, or group of doctors, declares a worker to be disabled, it should be possible for him to begin receiving social security retirement payments immediately, no matter what his

age. Such payments should continue if periodic medical examinations show that he is totally and permanently disabled and unemployable. The needs for food, housing, and health care are inexorable. They do not wait until a man becomes 50.

I further assert that a disabled insured worker must receive all he is entitled to under the social security law without suffering deduction of funds granted under any other Federal or State administered program.

Mr. President, with these three basic improvements—increased earnings limit, increased benefit and elimination of the arbitrary age 50 before disabled workers can collect benefits—the 1960's could well be the decade the 1950's should have been in the field of social legislation.

TRAVEL BY MULE TRAIN

It seems tragic that a huge, important and deserving segment of our population has been, economically speaking, travelling by mule train while most of our society has traveled by jet.

I refer to our fast-growing population of persons over 65.

Today, three-fifths of all Americans over 65 have less than $1,000 money income annually. Four-fifths have less than $2,000.

Aged widows, most of whom are on social security, are the most impoverished group in America. They receive on the average only $56 a month social security.

Coinciding with these shocking statistics is the fact that life expectancy of Americans is constantly increasing. The consequences of longer life on less money hold out the prospect of an increasingly impoverished, rapidly expanding elderly population.

Only an ostrich would fail to see that care of the aged has become a major national problem. This has been made shockingly clear in hearings conducted by my able and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

Part of this deep-rooted problem can be met and solved through basic improvements in the Social Security Act. The wage base for coverage and collection of social security tax should be increased to $6,000 and then it would follow that retirement payments would also be higher.

Finally, Mr. President, our social security program should be universal, covering all employed and self-employed, whatever the occupation or profession.

For years, the ruling clique of the American Medical Association, and its powerful lobby in Washington, have stool in the way of inclusion of the medical profession under the beneficent provisions of the social security program.

They have even resisted the strong sentiment within the ranks of the AMA itself to give coverage to doctors.

Wherever doctors have been polled—in Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York and other States—from 60 to 70 percent of them have expressed themselves in favor of compulsory social security coverage.

Notwithstanding this clear-cut evidence that medical men generally desire to be included within the provisions of our social security law, State medical associations and the American Medical Association continue to bar the door.

DENTISTS VOTED FOR COVERAGE

Men of the dental profession are protected by the Social Security Act. They were not dragooned into the program. They voted for coverage in referendums conducted by their various State dental associations.

Lawyers, too, are covered. Responding to the request of the vast majority of lawyers, Congress 3 years ago voted to include self-employed attorneys at law under social security.

Only the American Medical Association, through its leaders—that little group of willful men who rake in money from the medical profession and pay it out in salaries to themselves and in moneys to hire a lobby in Washington—has prevented the same coverage for physicians and surgeons, despite mounting evidence that most doctors themselves want it. The evidence shows that 70 percent of the physicians and surgeons in the United States desire to be included under the social security law.

Since 1935, and at the present time, the American Medical Association has vigorously opposed the inclusion of physicians and surgeons under social security coverage.

About 5 years ago, as president of the Cuyahoga County Bar Association, which is the second largest county bar association in the United States, I was privileged to appear as a witness before the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate and urge that self-employed lawyers be included within the coverage of social security. I do not believe it was because I made a good witness—lawyers never make good witnesses—but it is a fact that shortly after that time Congress voted to include self-employed attorneys at law, responding to the request of the vast majority of lawyers of the United States to have this coverage.

But the attitudes and actions of the American Medical Association keep doctors as the only professional men who are still holdouts.

Physicians and surgeons who helped bring us into the world are not protected by social security by reason of the failure of the small reactionary group of rulers, or dictators, operating the American Medical Association to represent the views of the membership—of the thousands of physicians and surgeons who are the rank and file members of the American Medical Association.

Incidentally, those of the undertaking profession or occupation or business, who help take us out of the world, do have coverage under social security, but the fine medical men of our country, who help bring us into the world, are denied coverage through the action of their own leaders, who are misleading them.

Social security is an insurance system; and it must remain so. This is not a mere pension system. It is actuarially sound.

Our social security system does not compete with private pension plans, but is complementary and supplementary to them.

PAY AS YOU GO

Our social security program is a pay-as-you-go program. We must keep it sound in every respect.

The hope we all cherish is an old age free from care and want. To that end people toil patiently and live closely, seeking to save something for the day when they can earn no more.

There was no more pitiful tragedy than the lot of the worker who had struggled all his life to gain a competence and who, at 65, was poverty stricken and dependent upon charity.

The dignity of every individual is involved. Something deep inside a person is offended if, after a lifetime of productive effort, all he or she gets is a handout.

An adequate old-age insurance program, reasonable aid to the unfortunate, and extension of retirement benefits is not statism, nor is it socialism.

If American industry—big business—can afford to pay huge pensions to retired officials who do not need them, is it state socialism when the people's representatives impose a tax on industry and on employees and self-employed to pay retirement and total disability pensions or social security payments to those who need them?

In expanding the system of safeguards against the hazards and cruelty of penniless old age or crippling disability, new concepts of security and human dignity are involved, as well as a new relationship between the individual and his Government.

Mr. President, I assert that the Federal Government can provide reasonable security for the aged and less fortunate among us without in any way sacrificing that liberty which we know as the American way of life.

The truth is, Mr. President, that the adoption of a modernized and expanded social security program such as I have outlined here today will mean a stronger, more vibrant America, a nation of expanded opportunity for all, where no one is forgotten, where the young have faith and the aged have hope, and where the dignity of the individual is still looked upon as the highest goal of civilized society.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

Mr. HENNINGS obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] designated "1–30–60–D."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum, so that Senators on this side of the aisle may come to the Chamber?

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I yield to the assistant minority leader for that purpose.

Mr. KUCHEL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, yesterday I called up my amendment lettered "D"; and the pending question is on agreeing to that amendment, which would change the definition of the term "political committee," so it would cover intrastate committees.

At that time there was considerable discussion about the aggregate amount which would require a committee to report in any calendar year. The present distinguished occupant of the chair (Mr. CASE of South Dakota) and I have also discussed this matter. I have welcomed his support and consideration and very strong and sincere feelings about the pending proposed legislation.

After further considering the matter with the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota, I now modify the amendment by striking out on page 1 of the amendment, in line 6, and on page 2, in line 4, the figure "$1,000", as it relates to the aggregate amount; and I substitute therefor "$2,500."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has a right to modify his amendment; and the amendment, as modified, will be read.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, before the clerk reads the amendment, as modified, I wish to make a further modification, by means of language which was contained in my original bill, as introduced in 1955 and in 1957; and, indeed, it was also in the bill which was before the Committee on Rules and Administration during the last session. I make these modifications because I do not feel that they materially or in any substantial way affect the philosophy or the broad purposes of the bill; and especially is that true in the case of the amendment which requires that the committees in a State make a report.

After discussion with the learned junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and others, and after considerable reflection and further consideration, both last night and today, I believe that these modifications should be made in order that we may not find ourselves parting company upon matters which really are not essential, but relate only—as in the one instance—to the sum of money to be specified; and bearing in mind that, under the provisions of the modified amendment, all amounts of $2,500 or more—instead of the former provision for all amounts of $1,000 or more—must be reported by every committee; and also bearing in mind that the amendment does not contain a provision which would prevent the creation and establishment of any number of functioning committees, so long as they reported within the meaning of the act, so the public might know the number of committees formed and engaging in activity in behalf of any candidate for election to public office.

So, in addition to changing the amount "$1,000" to "$2,500," which modification will to some extent simplify the reporting by some committees—inasmuch as the committees within the States will not in any wise be limited numerically, but will be limited only as to the reporting requirement—I also modify the amendment by reinserting provisions similar to those contained in the bill which I introduced at the beginning of the last session. Therefore, I undertake to further modify the amendment as follows:

On page 7, following line 25, insert the following:

(e) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) of this section shall also contain a list of the names of candidates in whose behalf contributions were received or expenditures made. In the case of political committees supporting more than one candidate (and State and local candidates), the amount of the total expenditures allocable to each candidate—

(1) shall be in the same ratio as expenditures on behalf of each candidate for printing and advertising, radio time, and television time bears to the total of such expenditures, or

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri have available a copy of his amendment, as modified?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes, Mr. President; and I am about to send it to the desk.

I wanted to explain it briefly, as I went along.

Mr. President, the reason for this amendment is that a number of Senators last night asked a number of penetrating, and I think important, questions relating to the allocation of expenditures where a committee supports more than one candidate; and, in conformity with and in compliance with suggestions, on which my colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has been consulted as well, it seems to me that it might have an even more salutary effect—as I thought it would in 1955 and 1957 when I introduced bills—to try to allocate, as between candidates, the amount spent.

I understand the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] desires to say something about this modification as well, and for that purpose I shall be very glad to yield to him, or to yield to him for any other purpose, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I feel this proposed amendment, which is substantially, though not exactly, the same as the wording of the bill as reported to the floor previously, will greatly strengthen the provisions of the amendment. A possibility that worried many of us was that if a Member of Congress was running on the same ticket with a sheriff, clerk, county treasurer, or other official, under the wording of the amendment as submitted originally, if a political committee—let us say one of the party committees—supported all of those candidates together and spent over $1,000, it would be required to make a Federal report.

I concede some difficulties in the allocation problem, but it seems to me the effect of this proposal is, to put it in possibly oversimplified but approximately correct language, if a Member of Congress were running together with 11 other candidates and the committee supporting them spent the same amount for all, that committee would not have to report unless it actually spent, under the original wording, over $12,000.

I agree with the suggestion for raising this limit, because we certainly do not want to unduly burden the Federal system with reports, and there will be a good many more reports coming in under this amendment than came in today. I support raising the limitation to $2,500——

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to observe, without interrupting the Senator's train of thought on the matter, there is, of course, no magic in numbers. The figure "$1,000" was selected and agreed upon as being a reasonable figure. Having received suggestions, including the principal suggestion emanating from the distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. CASE of South Dakota], that the amount be raised to $2,500, I can see that it will not appreciably affect the result that is sought, because the reporting provisions are there and the people will know how many substantial committees exist and how much those committees have spent on behalf of the candidates of any candidate or group of candidates.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Missouri. I feel this modification will greatly strengthen the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri and that his amendment as modified should command our support.

However, Mr. President, I believe it is necessary, since this proposal amends a different section, to ask unanimous consent, as I now do, that this amendment be considered and voted on with the original amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk would like to have the Chair inquire of the Senator from Missouri if it was the intent of the Senator from Missouri to modify his amendment originally to change the figure "$1,000" to "$2,500" in both places where it occurs.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes. I neglected to mention the second portion, appearing on page 2 of the amendment at line 4, and I appreciate the Chair's calling that to my attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk now has the amendment.

The modified amendment as provided by Mr. HENNINGS is as follows:

Page 3, strike out lines 3 to 12, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) The term 'political committee' includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $2,500 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors;".

On page 16, strike out lines 3 to 12, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) The term 'political committee' includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $2,500 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors;".

On page 7, following line 25, insert the following:

"(e) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) of this section shall also contain a list of the names of candidates in whose behalf contributions were received or expenditures made. In the case of political committees supporting more than one candidate (and State and local candidates), the amount of the total expenditures allocable to each candidate—

"(1) shall be in the same ratio as expenditures on behalf of each candidate for printing and advertising, radio time, and television time bears to the total of such expenditures, or

"(2) where no expenditures were made for Federal candidates for any of such purposes there shall be charged to each Federal candidate an amount equal to the full expenditure divided by the total number of candidates, Federal and State;"

except that expenditures specifically designated for an individual candidate shall be charged to such candidate.

Page 8, line 1, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] as he has modified it.

Mr. HENNINGS. Has my colleague from New York completed his discussion?

Mr. KEATING. I am through.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, by way of a further brief explanation, and I shall try to make it as simple and understandable as I am able to do, I think the test of the existing law and of the new bill as to whether a political committee is an interstate committee would no longer apply, because, in calling up the amendment yesterday, it changed the definition of "political committee" so that it would cover intrastate committees or committees functioning or operating in a State. It requires, in accordance with the modification of today, any committee which spends in excess of $2,500 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing Federal elections to report.

By submitting the amendment on primaries, which the Senate adopted late yesterday, I undertook to indicate, Mr. President, that that amendment is closely related to the amendment on political committees.

I should like to say most emphatically that every argument for or against the inclusion of primaries applies to the amendment which would seek to broaden the definition of political committees. The issues involved have been thoroughly debated for 4 days by the Senate. The main question was, and the main question still is, whether we want to be candid and open and forthright in reporting to the American people the uses of money in Federal elections. I think this question has been settled partially by the Senate as a result of the vote yesterday, and I think further discussion on that point certainly would serve no useful purpose at this time.

I wanted to clarify one point, Mr. President.

The able junior Senator from New York and the distinguished senior Senator from California, the assistant minority leader, asked me last night whether the cutoff amount of $1,000, which is now $2,500 because of the modification, was limited to contributions and expenditures for Federal candidates where intrastate committees support local, State and Federal candidates.

I undertook to say last night, and I repeat today, that only contributions and expenditures for Federal candidates are included in the cutoff amount of $2,500. I do not believe there was any doubt about it then, and I think the language in the definition is clear on this point.

The junior Senator from New York further asked me how the Federal portion of expenditures and contributions could be determined in the case of committees supporting candidates on different levels. I should like to undertake to again say that beginning with the original bill which I introduced in 1955 and continuing with the subsequent bills of 1957 and 1959 there was contained in each bill the broad definition of the term "political committee" as it appears in the present amendment. In addition to that, and because of this definition, the bills of 1955 and 1957 included an apportionment provision, to further clarify the point raised by the Senator from New York yesterday.

I have always thought that such an apportionment provision was really a corollary to the broader definition of "political committee," and for this reason I have modified my amendment to include this provision, which would establish rules for separating expenditures made for Federal candidates from those made for other candidates.

The line of interrogation pursued last night further convinced me of the correctness of the original bill and of the position I had undertaken to assume upon it; that is to say, that we should try to have some apportionment provision relating to a committee, when it supports more than one candidate for local, State, and Federal offices. But this does not in any sense change the essential purpose of the proposal.

I think the formula is very simple. The formula would require political committees to report the names of candidates which they support, and would further require that in the case of committees supporting more than one Federal candidate, as well as candidates on a State and local level, the amount to be allocated to each candidate should be determined by a double formula. When the committee made expenditures for printing and advertising, radio and television time, the allocable amount should be determined by the ratio of such expenditures with respect to each candidate. Where no such expenditure was made, the allocable amount should be derived by the division of the total expenditures by the number of candidates supported by the committee.

Mr. President, that seems to me to be about as close as we can approach any fair, reasonable, and honest way of getting at the matter of a committee supporting more than one candidate. It would cover the case where an intrastate committee transferred to another committee a sum of money to influence Federal elections. Furthermore, expenditures specifically designated for an individual would be, under the formula, charged to that candidate and to no other.

Thus I believe, Mr. President, that the modification is logically interconnected with the amendment on the redefinition of the term "political committee."

The questions of the distinguished Senator from California and of the distinguished Senator from New York prove this, I think, beyond any reasonable doubt. I urge that the amendment, containing the modifications which have been made, be agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arizona, or does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. HENNINGS. I will yield to my colleague, the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri yields to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, has the amendment to the amendment been agreed to by the Senate?

Mr. HENNINGS. I will say to the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has only been modified; it has not been voted on.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The modification has not been voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Arizona. The Senator from Missouri was modifying his own amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Which requires no approval, of course.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is my understanding.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So the pending amendment is the amendment with the $2,500 amount rather than the $1,000 amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Illinois permit the Chair to interrupt?

The Parliamentarian states that it is true ordinarily a modification to an

amendment does not have to be approved. In this instance it has already been agreed to that in respect to its multiple parts the amendment should be considered en bloc. The Parliamentarian tells the Chair it can be considered en bloc. Apparently we do have a little different situation from the ordinary situation, when a Senator simply asks to modify his own amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri yields to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proposed changes by the Senator from Missouri be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has heard the request of the Senator from Montana. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois reserves the right to object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall not object. Even with the larger amount, Mr. President, I think the amendment is as offensive as it was before, because the modification of the amount does not affect the principle involved. I thought I uttered my own sentiments on the matter last night, and there is very little I have to offer on the subject beyond that.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York reserves the right to object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I point out that a modification of the amount is only one of the modifications which have been made to the amendment, the other modification being, in substance, to provide that a report will be required only when the $2,500 was spent for the particular candidate. So if there were a proliferation of candidates it would require an allocation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, my request was that all modifications be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois reserves the right to object, and is recognized for his reservation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from New York, when he used the word "proliferation" he used the best word in the dictionary to indicate precisely what is going to happen.

Mr. KEATING. I learned that from my friend.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are going to proliferate all of the difficulties, because when it comes time for a county committee or any other committee to set up an allocations scheme on its books, to see how it can separate the money which will come into a common treasury, as to how much is spent for the congressional candidate, how much for the senatorial candidate, how much for the sheriff, how much for the Governor, and how much for the county coroner, that is when the difficulties and prolixities really will begin.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the minority leader has approved the word "proliferation." I have tried to avoid it in the course of the debate, because it is a word which is susceptible of many interpretations. But this amendment would certainly proliferate the opportunity and means whereby the people who vote, the American public, could scrutinize the situation to determine where the money being sent to candidates for the purpose of encouraging and supporting their candidacies is coming from. It would proliferate the opportunity for any candidate adverse to the candidate receiving the funds to discuss the question of the source of the funds, the number of committees, and all other things which may be of cognate or related interest.

So again I say to my friend the able minority leader that we may use the word "proliferate" in many senses. I believe this amendment would create a proliferation, so to speak, by increasingly making abundant the opportunity of the people of the country to know who is behind campaign financing, where the money is spent, who the people are who contribute it, and other facts as to which they are entitled to have knowledge in considering the qualifications of a candidate, together with his other qualifications.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Missouri yield in order that the Chair may submit the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, inasmuch as it seems that the debate on this amendment has run its course, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor. Does he yield for that purpose?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], I have introduced a bill (S. 2751) to maintain the special milk program at its current rate during 1960–61. To continue as at present, the program needs more funds to meet the steady rise in the number of schools and school children.

Mr. President, this situation is graphically pointed out in a resolution I have just received from the California State Board of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM, UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE, MONDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1959

Whereas the Congress of the United States authorized the use of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of increasing the consumption of fluid milk by children in nonprofit schools of high school grade and under; and

Whereas, in 1958, Congress authorized a basic annual expenditure of not to exceed $75 million, and in August of this year Congress increased the 1960 authorization to $81 million and established $84 million for 1961; and

Whereas the Director of the Food Distribution Division of the U.S. Department of Agricultural Marketing Service has advised the California State Superintendent of Public Instruction that effective March 1, 1960, the maximum subsidy per half pint would be reduced one-half cent; and

Whereas California schools entered into the program in good faith and have more than doubled milk consumption by school children since 1954. A reduction in the rate of reimbursement in the face of rising milk prices will force schools to increase charges to pupils, which will result in reduced participation. A decrease in the rates in March and a return to the original rates in July will cause confusion and create administrative difficulties at the State and local level: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the California State Board of Agriculture, meeting at Sacramento, Calif., on December 21, 1959, does hereby recommend that sufficient funds be made available to continue the special milk program through this current school year without change; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to the Governor of the State of California, the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, and the California congressional delegation.

THE PATH OF WAR OR THE PATHS OF PEACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article which I prepared for the New Year's edition of the Miami News, entitled "The Path of War or the Paths of Peace," which expresses some of my thoughts about the role of the United States in the coming decade.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PATH OF WAR OR THE PATHS OF PEACE

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

The sixties ahead could mean for mankind peace and security, or they could be the years in which man takes the final, irrevocable plunge into disaster. American leadership or lack of it may well be the determining factor.

Every new year gives each man and nation a chance to begin anew; the commencement of a new decade seems to offer the chance to think boldly ahead, to choose new directions, to reach more confidently toward a better and more just world. But mankind enters the sixties weighed down with the terrible burdens of his own creation, carrying into the new decade with him weapons of unimaginable power and sophistication. By comparison with these dark works of man, we have been able to fashion only the most primitive beginnings of new institutions designed for *living* and not for dying.

Like legendary Prometheus, man is dangerously close to becoming the permanent victim of his own thirst for knowledge and power. For the discovery of the awful secrets of the atom has not been accompanied by a breakthrough in the understanding of man's inner nature and of his social and political institutions.

Other world developments, not confined to the great leaps forward in technology, cast their shadows forward into the sixties. The ferment in Asia, Africa, and Latin America continues. The steady stream of revolts against European domination has been accompanied by an amazing record of successes in overthrowing corrupt and antiquated political and social structures. While the *Communists* have sought to capture the leadership of these revolutionary movements, they have more fundamental causes. In one sense they are the fruit of those rising expectations first kindled in North America in 1776, fed by a gradually rising literacy throughout the world, and blown into flame by the passionate dedication to freedom of men like Gandhi.

The economic and technological successes of the Communists must continue to be reckoned with through the next 10 years. And it is clearly not the Soviet Union alone that is our concern. Russian rockets, symbolizing the meteoric rise of Soviet power, have tended to obscure an even more massive (perhaps bloodier and more ruthless, to be sure) reorganization of an economically primitive society by the Communists in China. We of the free world must learn to recognize these successes in industrialization as a most fundamental challenge to our survival.

For the Soviet challenge is not confined to blunt, direct military threat and economic competition. The material achievements of communism inevitably make a strong appeal to the billions of people now straining to rise from the mud and filth of centuries of repression in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

At the same time, mankind finds at the end of the fifties immeasurably greater wealth and power at his hand—power and wealth which could transform life for half the world. The spectacular advances in nuclear energy, in communications and transportation, have overshadowed other long strides forward—in agricultural production, for example, in the automation of industry, and in gains in living standards for the working classes in America and Europe through the trade union movement. The creation of huge resources of disposable wealth in North America, and more lately in Western Europe and the Soviet Union, reflects a historic achievement; man in these areas is now capable of producing far more goods and services than he can possibly consume. Few have yet recognized, moreover, that American surplus food and fiber production is real wealth of a uniquely useful and noninflationary character.

In 1960, then, man's state is a paradox. Surrounded by real wealth in some areas, yet fearfully threatened by the weapons of his own creation, man has woefully lagged in organizing his economic and spiritual resources for the primary task of establishing a just peace in the world.

Huge masses of people throughout the world live on the edge of starvation; even in the United States there are large pockets of unemployment and genuine distress. As Aristotle commented, "Poverty is the parent of revolution and crime." And wherever poverty remains in the world—together with the new knowledge that there is no divine mandate for poverty—men may turn to violence. In American slums and in the African bush, in the coalfields of West Virginia and the dry lands of the Middle East, poverty breeds despair and often violence. The more desperate the poverty, the more violent the inevitable reaction. It may take the form of delinquency, or it may take shape in powerfully organized drives to overturn a whole society.

With the rising living standards in the Soviet Union, we have concurrently observed adjustments in the internal and external political policies of the Soviet leadership. The desperate economic straits of the Chinese people, on the other hand, are reflected in the violent and fanatical policies of the Communist Chinese leaders. There is reason to believe that the emerging differences between the two major Communist societies is in part due to the differences in economic well-being between their peoples.

In the coming decade, the one achievement which would contribute most to the freedom and security of America would be the successful launching of a worldwide cooperative attack on the common enemy of every society—poverty, with its evil companions of disease, hunger, ignorance, and fear. In this war on poverty all nations—free and Communist—can be allies. Preferably this cooperative effort should be undertaken through the United Nations and its related agencies. However, if methods could not be worked out rapidly, then we must find new means through other bilateral and multilateral efforts. Peace and security for America are not possible in a world of the hungry, the sick, and the illiterate.

Concurrently, no matter what the cost in energy and capital, we must keep our noses to the grindstone of disarmament. This means not only patient and tenacious negotiating, but also restoring our ability to negotiate effectively from a position of military strength. Paradoxically, in order to achieve disarmament in the next decade, we shall certainly have to increase our bargaining position with our Communist opponents by rebuilding our military capabilities to the point where the Communists are convinced they have nothing to gain by perpetuating the arms race. The very commencement of an intensive 3- to 5-year effort to restore our military position might alone be sufficient to convince the Communists—if the effort is obviously in dead earnest.

The drive toward an essentially disarmed world, and one in which poverty is not constantly churning the political waters is well within the Free World's capability. But it is necessary to decide to make the drive, to make the necessary plans, and to organize the necessary human and economic and spiritual resources. If the American people can be convinced that leadership in the works of peace is the only rational alternative to a world in arms and eventual destruction of all free institutions, they will contribute whatever is necessary to success.

Perhaps greater than the threat of Communist power in the decade ahead is the danger that we of the Free World will fail to see further than the immediate problem of communism, fail to see that mankind is struggling against more fundamental and formidable enemies. The challenge of the coming years is whether we more fortunate nations will choose to do in this world not simply what we are forced to do in order to survive from year to year, but what we ought to do because it is right and just. To follow the compassionate teachings of the great religious faiths of the world by their conscious and consistent application to national policy is the only way to peace, to security, to greatness.

Not fear of communism but faith in ourselves, not mere reaction to the threat from a competing society but bold initiative to seek out and defeat the older and greater enemies of all men—these must be the watchwords of free men and women.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is entitled to the courteous attention of the Senate. Those Senators who wish to converse will please retire to the cloakrooms. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

POLITICAL LEVERAGE FOR ECONOMIC SECURITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the American Council on Human Rights recently sponsored an address delivered by the Ambassador of the Republic of Panama to the United Nations, the Honorable George W. Westerman. Entitled "Political Leverage for Economic Security," the Ambassador's remarks touch on the importance of internal democracy to insure the full use of national resources in economic growth. The Ambassador explains, "The American political system of representative government with its constitutional guarantees of individual rights played a major role in social and economic growth."

Mr. President, I note that the American Council on Human Rights is a federation of national college sororities whose objective is to fight minority discriminations and to seek human rights through action and education.

To bring Dr. Westerman's text on "Political Liberties and Economic Growth" to the notice of the Senate, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL LEVERAGE FOR ECONOMIC SECURITY

Address delivered by His Excellency Ambassador Geo. W. Westerman, United Nations Delegation of Panama, under auspices of the American Council on Human Rights, at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., on Saturday, October 17

It is my pleasure to bring you greetings from President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr., and the people of the Republic of Panama.

Genuine concern about the future of freedom and human rights is a healthy sign in a democracy, and it deserves appreciation. The American Council on Human Rights is to be warmly congratulated for its timely, forward-looking, vital programs of action in keeping the lamps of democracy trimmed and burning. I am indeed happy for this occasion to participate in your workshop and share your fine spirit of friendship and fellowship.

In an unforgettable movie Charlie Chaplin, as a glazier, employs Jackie Coogan to throw stones into shop windows, whereupon he providentially passes by and obtains the job of repairing the damage. The ingenious twist consists here in combining, under a single command, disequilibrating and equilibrating functions. Depending upon one's point of view, the act of window breaking may be regarded as destructive or constructive. I find in it an illustration of what I conceive as the principal roles of Federal, State, and local government, as well as the individual

citizen, in helping to provide political leverage for economic security for all of the Nation.

The Government in its executive, judicial, and legislative functions is in a commanding position to initiate democratic social and economic growth through forward thrusts that are meant to create incentives, guideposts, and pressures for further democratic action; and then it must stand ready to react to, and alleviate, these pressures in a variety of areas. The Government must take progressive measures to the end that in the social order human rights and fundamental freedoms are increasingly respected and fulfilled.

The realization of fundamental freedoms for all citizens depends upon the degree of democratic maturity and economic welfare in any given country. These again are dependent on the moral education on one hand, and a high standard of living on the other, are the two indispensable conditions for the achievement of the high ideals expressed in the concept of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The United States has not always been a capitalist democracy. At the time of the Declaration of Independence, the United States was a Nation of pioneer farmers and craftsmen with elements of feudalism in the South and some other areas, and with a class of slaves at the bottom of the social and economic scale. Only some 95 years ago did slavery disappear. With vast resources the American people gradually created for themselves an economic, political and spiritual environment which has been notable in the fact that it generated the birth of constructive ideas in every direction.

North America was the frontier of Europe. Over the centuries immigrants flocked to these shores in search of freedom. An urge toward progress has been part and parcel of American thinking, American social environment from the days of the earliest settlers. The American people tended quickly to throw off the old and seek the new. This questing spirit made itself increasingly evident in the continuous advances in technology, new inventions, new processes, new materials, and new machinery.

This country's representative democratic form of government was the principal factor in promoting fast growth in the early stages of its history. Obviously, the American political system of representative government with its constitutional guarantees of individual rights played a major role in social and economic growth. These are the rights which are found at the core of her growth.

The American economy has grown notably in many dimensions—in total population, total production, total employment and, most strikingly, in the variety of its products, services and occupations. The American standard of living has risen to be unquestionably the highest in the world and it has tremendous potential for providing a progressively increasing level of living for the American people. In order to obtain full advantage of this high potential it will be necessary to overcome certain existing but surmountable forces that place a drag on the dynamicity of growth.

In short, the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms is not a problem to be solved simply by a priori legal definitions and enactments; but by conditions of life, social and individual, which in turn demand the legal recognition and enforcement of certain relationships between the individual and society. Liberty and security for the individual in society are based on reciprocity. His personal, civil and political liberty are secure against the encroachment of the state on one hand and, on the other, the state guarantees his right to the attainment of social and economic security.

It is a fatal misconception to suppose that the progressive establishment of a social order, in which human rights and fundamental freedoms can be fully realized, may be achieved merely by the pursuance of governmental policies. It should not be forgotten that the State does not and cannot and must not control all social and economic life.

Most of us interpret freedom today, not as a frozen, static achievement, but as a process of continuous fight against changing enemies and weapons. Many of us realize now that the very concept of freedom has of necessity been subjected to historical changes, both in its philosophical basis and in its practical implementation. The real question, therefore, concerns the extent to which traditional concepts of freedom are applicable to a world plagued by economic and emotional insecurity alike, and by the constant threat of depression and war.

In this country the U.S. Constitution is regarded as a basic foundation of human rights. As stated in the Preamble, the Fathers of the Constitution set out to "secure the blessings of liberty to" themselves and to their posterity. Consequently, human rights of the utmost importance are set forth in the original articles of the Constitution as well as in the famous first ten amendments known as the Bill of Rights. Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of press, right of peaceable assembly and petition, due process of law, to mention only a few of those rights, are well known to us all.

The Civil War amendments, embracing articles 13 through 15, have lately been on the lips of most Americans. The 14th amendment especially has had the attention of the highest courts in the land. These amendments abolished slavery, defined citizenship and rights of Negroes, and provided for the enfranchisement of the Negro.

In this period of worldwide social and political change, it behooves every American to know the fundamentals of the Constitution, which, in times of stress as well as in peace, has provided the American people with as enduring and practical a form of government as has been seen on the face of the earth. Generations gave these human rights to you, and it is for you in turn to "secure the blessings of liberty" to yourselves and to your posterity, strengthened and enriched while in your hands.

There are some rights which are essential for the enjoyment of all other human rights and must, therefore, be thoroughly secured by law and moral force. Civil liberties are generally accepted as one objective criterion of freedom. Civil rights stand high on the list of basic human rights. The right to vote, to work where you are qualified, live where you want, the right to educate your children in the schools of your Nation without regard to color, religion or nationality—these are some of the civil rights for which you are now fighting. Many of your rights in these respects have been misused, abused and neglected. Although denied again and again by arbitrary power, the rights of man have been defended by good American citizens of both races and in the courts for many years. The fight for these rights must continue without interruption.

All too many people—black and white alike—take freedom and democracy for granted. Eternal vigilance is indeed the price of liberty. We must really believe in freedom, equality, and justice—keep a watchful eye on it and be willing to fight for it.

A great need of this Nation like in most democratic states, is more active participation in political life by informed, alert citizens of both races. My country of Panama being no exception. Here in the United States we are aware that not all American citizens have the freedom to function in political parties, become political candidates, or to vote. Legal and quasi-legal tactics, physical intimidation, and economic reprisals are the cudgels used to deprive colored Americans of their rights under the law. This is indeed a sad commentary on American democracy.

It is sadder still to recall the rights and privileges not denied to some segments of the American Negro populace which they apparently do not fully exercise. There are those Negroes who have the right to vote but fail to do so. The failure of Negroes in the Northern, Western, and border States to turn out to vote on election day is largely responsible, we have been told, for lack of representation in city councils, State legislatures and even in your Congress. This situation is most unfortunate as it deprives you of political power so much needed to attain better civil rights status.

All too frequently Negroes for one reason or another are reported to evade jury duty when called upon to serve in this vital capacity. All this at a time when important breakthroughs have been made in some States where Negroes are for the first time in history being allowed to serve on juries along with their white fellow Americans.

Equally important is the development of skills in civic participation and of attitudes of civic responsibility. These factors are of great significance to America's Negro citizens if they hope to close the gaps between the American creed and American practice. Can Negroes expect to win equal footing in civil rights by court action alone? Most assuredly not. They must work where they are needed and where they can as citizens in their communities. Adopting a "let George do it" attitude is a luxury Negroes cannot afford. Positive action is a must for every right thinking American Negro to make this country a better place for all its citizens through support of fine, public-spirited, dedicated organizations such as the NAACP, the National Urban League, the American Council on Human Rights, to name but a few.

Not long ago the name "Little Rock" exploded a racial atom bomb in these United States. The fallout of its publicity dust registered around the world. It was registered in Moscow and Peiping and taken as further evidence that American democracy does not mean what it says. It was registered throughout the 20 Latin American Republics where sentiments of common human decency were grossly outraged. It was registered through Africa and Asia and stirred the resentment of hundreds of millions who felt personally affected by the fortunes of their kin in Arkansas.

The waiting game currently being played in Prince Edward County, Va., has high stakes in a community's public schools and the education of its future citizens. It is a tragic situation. Those who feel that the issue at stake is more important than public education should beware lest one day they awake to find their children intellectually and morally crippled by their diehard defiance of the laws of this great land. The spirit of togetherness uniting the foes of democracy should be channelized into worthwhile pursuits—something more worthy than closing schools. The enemies of freedom are tampering with education—the very foundation of the democratic American way of life.

We have had many lessons that there is a direct and inescapable relation between the bread box and the ballot box. The free labor movement of this Nation should be encouraged to take a more active role in world affairs instead of leaving it up to politicians and diplomats. Labor's war against poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease must continue and vigorously so. It must purge itself of its detractors and work harder to secure effective legislation in the interest of human welfare. In the same area, labor must abandon discrimination in its ranks. Organized labor more than any other sector of the American scene, can ill afford the

specter of injustice, inequality, and discrimination. Full utilization of Negro labor is economically sound.

When any spot on the globe is within a few flying hours of your home airport and the welfare of the so-called heathen in the farthest land affects your community, there is actually harm in pretending you can live behind a Chinese wall. As citizens of this land you are also international citizens. A belief in the United Nations, international economic cooperation, and international understanding are as important to American Negroes as to any other American. Most people give too little emphasis to their duties to the world.

The importance of mutual aid for the economic welfare of the underdeveloped areas of the free world is everywhere recognized among free men. Many share the conviction that a really bold and purposeful program to underwrite economic development should be a main component of the foreign economic policy of the United States and of its Western Allies. A sound program of economic aid and technical assistance capable of giving momentum to economic advancement must be positive, farsighted, imaginative, adequate in size and scope, coordinated, and sustained.

Such a program would clearly be in the interest of the underdeveloped areas. But it would equally serve the vital interests of the United States and the Western members of the free world, because it affords a good prospect of transforming unstable and poor nations dangerously close to frustration into stable, progressive, and responsible states. The security of the West will be undermined if the aspirations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America for economic betterment, independence, and political equality are frustrated by lack of resources to build viable and productive economies.

The importance of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to the United States cannot be overemphasized whether the area concerned is political, economic or cultural. It is, therefore, encouraging to note that several agencies of international repute have, within recent days, all been unanimous in urging a more positive attitude toward Latin America. They advocate identification on a national scale with the aspirations of the Latin American peoples for social reforms, higher standards of living and increased educational opportunities. In effect, they are demanding an urgent and basic tenet of U.S. policy for this hemisphere.

Only today the National Academy of Sciences, meeting in this same city, took into account the rapid political evolution of African nations and advocated to the International Cooperation Administration adoption of a multimillion-dollar technical aid program to help Africa's social progress catch up with its political development. This observation of the NAS is being based on the fact that the new political entities are generally ill equipped to handle the technical and scientific responsibilities so fundamental to their sound future development.

Economic stability sets a goal which challenges the energies of all classes of a nation and provides outlets for the exercise of the talents of a people. The compensations to the United States for supplying aid are very real. They are the satisfaction from participating in a challenging and rewarding task, and the creation of political, economic, and social conditions in the less developed lands likely to make them stable, willing members of the free world.

You represent a substantial segment of this country's voting population. This being the case you can influence to a great extent the political leverage necessary to promote the economic security of which neighboring states of this hemisphere and new emerging countries in Africa and Asia are in dire need. Your duty then, should be very evident in giving political support to President Eisenhower's most recent call for greater technical, financial and material assistance to less fortunate peoples and countries.

The boughs of the Tree of Liberty may be swayed this way and that by recent political gales, but their strength to withstand the wind comes from the depth and toughness of their roots in the past. Our past sufferings are meant to teach us how to build a new future. The American people are faced with an unparalleled opportunity and a high responsibility. It lies within your power to lead the world into a racial utopia which in the past has been a mere dream. It may be a distant goal, but it is within the range of achievement as a practical matter.

The timetable for democracy must be stepped up. The eyes of the world are upon these United States—watching and waiting. North America must take a firm stand on human rights and fundamental freedoms in these trying times of racial tension.

Will anyone here deny that our era is overshadowed by the threat of the staggering destructive power given into human hands? In order, then, to eliminate this ominous shadow the world must unite not only against the horror of war but for the fulfillment of peaceful progress. I repeat, the strengthening of peace in the world requires the coordinated action of democracy, the respect for the principle of international morality and the fostering of economic security of the individual.

It must be a source of personal pleasure to you as it is to me that your country and mine are continuing actively in the United Nations Organization of which they were sponsoring members. As this organization approaches the 14th anniversary of its founding, the world in ferment would do well to reflect upon its growth and development. I am assured that both the United States and Panama will be single in the purpose of urging the entire world to reaffirm its faith in the U.N.'s charter. The aim of this charter, known to everyone, is in conformity with the concepts of social justice and a just application of the principles of settlement of international disputes, to establish peace, and to develop friendly relations among states, thereby ensuring the welfare of mankind.

Sir Winston Churchill in one of his notable postwar addresses cogently observed:

"Laws just or unjust may govern men's actions. Tyrannies may restrain or regulate their words. The machinery or propaganda may pack their minds with falsehoods and deny them truth for many generations of time. But the soul of man thus held in trance or frozen in a long night can be awakened by a spark coming from God knows where and in a moment the whole structure of lies and oppression is on trial for its life. Peoples in bondage need never despair."

Those words are of deep and lasting import. They are also the lesson of history, the promise of today and a beacon of hope for the future. The message is clear and unmistakable. Peoples in bondage do not need ever despair. Negroes need never despair. The knowledge of their right to freedom and justice, the elevation of American ideals and aspirations, the observance of the spirit of the U.N. Charter, and the turmoil which today is taking place in the thinking of all humanity guarantee the eventual triumph of justice and the disappearance of bigotry, tyranny and oppression.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S WHEAT PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this morning the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] referred to a certain agricultural study which gave us pertinent economic information relating to the plight of the American farmer. Congress has been served notice that the administration will continue to recommend wheat legislation which can result only in an increased supply of wheat and an increased cost to the taxpayer, and still lower prices and income for wheat farmers.

The administration remains adamant in its adherence to theories which have been discredited by reputable agricultural economists. More is at stake than a perpetually depressed agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will suspend. If the Senate desires a recess, the Chair will see that one is provided. But the Senate will not proceed until there is order.

The Senator from Minnesota may now proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I said that more is at stake than a perpetually depressed agriculture. High-production low-price agriculture means diminished purchasing power for farmers. This in turn spells trouble for all who sell goods and services to farmers.

The report described earlier today by the Senator from Louisiana indicates that the projection of agricultural income by the Department of Agriculture is a further depressed income, with reduced net profits for farm producers, reduced farm prices, and a reduction in total farm income. It appears to me that this kind of prognostication on the part of the administration should alert Congress to what needs to be done to stop what will be a real depression in America's farm areas unless some steps are taken of a corrective nature.

Regrettably, the administration has no farm program. The administration's program is to do more of what it has already done; and to do more of what it has been doing will result in reduced farm income, a reduction in the number of farms and farmers, and a rise in farm indebtedness.

Mr. President, a very thoughtful discussion of what the administration's proposal would do for the average farmer appears in an editorial published in the January, 1960, issue of Capper's Farmer, an old and respected farm publication. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, which is an analysis of the administration's wheat program, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Capper's Farmer, February 1960]

LET'S NOT ABANDON CONTROLS

Secretary of Agriculture Benson has a warmed-over farm program to present to Congress when it convenes in January. The program has the blessing of President Eisenhower.

The Secretary's proposals should be recognized for what they are—a move to kill the wheat program, as he already has done for corn.

Besides the usual promises of increased research and stronger foreign sales effort, the proposals include more conservation reserve and a stepped-up rural development program.

The dynamite in the program is the proposal to remove controls on wheat and fix supports to a 3-year moving average mar-

ket price. That means abandonment of marketing quotas and the parity principle.

Capper's Farmer believes this move is inconsiderate, ill-timed, and unwise. It is neither to the best interests of farmers nor the American economy.

The Secretary makes his proposal at the time his own USDA economists estimate a $2 billion drop in net farm income for 1959. They predict a further $1 billion drop for 1960. Should the proposed wheat plan be adopted, economists foresee a further cut of $500 million to $1 billion by 1961.

Such a prospect is cause for grave public concern. Not only would the living standards of farm families suffer a disastrous blow, but the depleted purchasing power of rural America would be a serious threat to the Nation's economy.

What Mr. Benson is proposing would put wheat in direct competition with corn and the other feed grains in a few brief years. Hog raisers, already in trouble, would be hurt badly if millions of bushels of wheat were dumped into the national feedbin. Pressure of cheap feed makes more hogs and cheaper hogs.

In short, Mr. Benson wants to put wheat, along with corn, in a free market situation. Economists at Iowa State University recently have completed a study in which they estimate what farm prices might be under a free market with unrestricted production.

Assuming that all feed grains would be used, these men see average price of hogs down to $10.80 by 1962–63. Cattle would average $11.51. Corn would be 66 cents a bushel and wheat 74 cents.

As costly and cumbersome as the present program is, it is probable that the Benson-Eisenhower plan would be even more cumbersome—and costly. For example, C. R. Harris, University of California economist, estimates it would cost U.S. taxpayers some $400 million a year more than the present program costs.

Capper's Farmer does not believe the alternative to our present program is abandonment of production controls and price supports.

We believe there is a growing realization at the grassroots that some sort of a compulsory production control plan is necessary for a stabilized farm income. (See Today's Farming, Washington, p. 16.)

We urge that Congress summarily dismiss this attempt to abandon production controls and supports on wheat. We also urge the congressional agriculture committees to get to the job of writing a workable program that farmers and city people can live with.

A workable farm program must be in parts to fit the various commodities. We doubt that we can find one overall pattern. First, let us work on wheat. It is our biggest worry.

Last May, Capper's Farmer described the domestic parity plan for wheat and suggested that Congress give wheatgrowers a chance to vote on it. We think it is fair to both growers and consumers, and it would be self-financing.

Some acreage in a soil bank would be compulsory, and growers would take part payment in wheat until CCC holdings were reduced to a reasonable reserve.

We favor giving feed grain producers an opportunity to vote on a soil bank plan—one that would take enough land out of crops to reduce surpluses.

In any allotment or self-help legislation, the commodity group should be given a clean-cut, realistic choice to say whether it wants full rein to produce for a free market, or a program whereby it will accept production controls.

Some groups are asking for self-help programs. Let's be daring enough to give them a trial. Some of the supplemental programs are worthy of expansion. Surely we can find some way of getting more food into the stomachs of the hungry and undernourished here at home and overseas.

We have a "Food for Peace" program in Public Law 480. But let's get it out of the hand-to-mouth stage and make it fully effective in aiding developing nations.

As a consuming nation, we have everything to gain by the administration of a farm program that will help farmers obtain their fair share of the national income.

Our economy cannot exist half controlled and half free. Agriculture, too, must thrive if we Americans are to be assured of a continuing abundant food supply.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many persons have said there appears to be no particular solution of the farm question. I submit that there is a solution. One is before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a proposal which was discussed this morning, a proposal which I offered last year, known as the family farm development program.

A second possible solution is the use of our food and fiber abundance. I shall be looking forward to the recommendations of the administration relating to the use of our wheat.

I noticed that the President gave a remarkable address at New Delhi, India, and spoke about declaring war on hunger. I fully support that declaration. I await the details of the battle. I simply wonder what forces are to be deployed, what tools and weapons are to be used, and when the trumpet will be sounded, so that we can tell when the battle is under way and what troops will be placed in the field.

It appears to me that it is one thing to make a speech about war on hunger, and it is a second thing to present to Congress a program which will utilize the food and fiber we have as a constructive instrument of American farm policy.

I suggest to the President that he can find some good guide lines for a constructive policy by an examination of the reports of the food and agricultural organization of the United Nations, and an examination of a bill before Congress entitled "Food for Peace," and ultimately, possibly, long-term credits for the nations which need food to take care of their food deficits. I for one will pledge wholehearted cooperation to the working out of such a program, which is necessary if we are to solve our problems in agriculture.

Reducing the number of farmers, cutting down more and more on production, and reducing the number of farms will ultimately place America on the list of food deficit areas. If the present program is continued, that is exactly what will happen.

WILDERNESS BILL DESERVES SUPPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was very much heartened to read an article in the Albert Lea Tribune for January 3, 1960, entitled "Wilderness Bill Deserves Support of All of Us," by Maude M. Koevenig. Maude Koevenig is very much aware that the wilderness bill (S. 1123), which I was proud to introduce, with my distinguished cosponsors, has been the subject of hearings by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and is pending measure of that committee. I thank the chairman of that committee [Mr. MURRAY], our very eminent colleague, for his interest in this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILDERNESS BILL DESERVES SUPPORT OF ALL OF US

(By Maude M. Koevenig)

One of the most treasured gifts that Joe and I received for Christmas is a copy of the beautiful book, "America's Wonderlands, the National Parks," published by the National Geographic Society.

In view of the present delay in getting the wilderness bill passed by Congress, one can gain hope by remembering that the National Park Act was 5 years in Congress before being finally passed on August 25, 1916.

At the present time we take this priceless heritage of beauty and history pretty much for granted. However, the same type of opposition that is delaying passage of the wilderness bill, also keeps trying to invade, exploit, and thus destroy our national parks.

As support for the wilderness bill widens, traditional opposition of lumber, grazing, mining, and other commercial users of our public land stiffens.

A REASON

Please keep on reading, because at the end of today's column I'm going to ask a favor and give you a chance to do something important.

Such a magazine as Science, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, expresses hope that the wilderness bill will be passed at the next session of Congress.

The Minneapolis Tribune has urged passage of the bill, stating "few things facing the 86th Congress have as much permanent value as the wilderness bill."

Montana Wildlife, published by the Montana Fish and Game Department, expressed its agreement with "principles expressed in the proposed wilderness legislation." An editorial in the June 1959 issue said:

"We look, therefore, to a planned wilderness preservation system as insurance that we may continue to provide outstanding recreational opportunities, so important to Montana and the entire Nation.

"We believe that this program may be accomplished without jeopardizing other important uses of public lands. We sincerely hope that national wilderness preservation may soon become a definite policy of Congress."

"Congress should go ahead with the measure, this session, and see to it that our wildernesses are preserved," the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times wrote in an editorial entitled "Special Interests in the Wilds."

OTHER REASONS, TOO

The editorial pointed out that preservation of wildernesses is needed "not only for their esthetic and historic value, but for the practical purposes the bill envisions, such as watershed protection, the opportunity to study plant and animal life in primitive surroundings, and for recreation."

Let the members of both Senate and House Interior Committees know of your support of the wilderness bill. Ask them to vote out the bill promptly. Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, is chairman of the Senate committee.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of Colorado, is chairman of the House committee, and one Minnesotan, ODIN LANGEN, is a member. What you can do is write our own Senators and Representative and ask them to speak to committee members and tell them of your interest.

Ask them to vote for the bill when it comes up for passage. Address your letters: Senator (or Representative): (Name), Senate or House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

I figure that anyone who doesn't know the names of his Senators and his Representative wouldn't write anyway. I'm sure that Mr. LANGEN would be glad to receive letters from Minnesota people to let him know they are interested in the wilderness bill.

Opposition to the wilderness bill comes from those who want to turn everything into money immediately. They remind me of the type Thoreau describes in Walden, "who would carry the landscape, who would carry his God to market if he could get anything for Him."

RACIAL PROBLEMS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I read in the Washington Post on January 2, 1960, excerpts from a lecture given by Dr. John A. Hannah. Called Racial Problems Pose Acid Test, this speech is all the more compelling because Dr. Hannah is both the Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and the president of Michigan State University.

Dr. Hannah states:

In the few busy months of its existence, the Civil Rights Commission has learned that the basic problem is one of securing the full rights of American citizenship to those being denied in any degree "that vital recognition of human dignity, the equal protection of the laws." It has learned that, by and large, the problem is a racial problem.

At the time of the report of the Civil Rights Commission, I called the attention of this body to the suggestion that Federal registrars enroll the voters in cases of arbitrary denials of the right to vote. I have introduced legislation, the Federal Elections Registration Act, to assure that citizens of the United States will not be denied the right to vote in Federal elections because of their race, religion, color, or national origin.

In the context of Dr. John Hannah's speech, Mr. President, I agree with his encouraging view on the extension of our voting franchise in this country. Historically, we have extended the franchise to nonproperty owners, to women, and gradually, to other segments of the population. As Dr. Hannah states:

Indeed, the lag in Negro voting in some sections of the South is almost the sole remaining disfiguring blot on a record of which to be proud.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Hannah's remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 2, 1960]

RACIAL PROBLEMS POSE ACID TEST

(By John A. Hannah)

(These excerpts are taken from a recent lecture delivered before the annual meeting of the Anti Defamation League of B'nai B'rith in New York. Dr. Hannah, president of Michigan State University, is Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.)

In the few busy months of its existence, the Civil Rights Commission has learned that the basic problem is one of securing the full rights of American citizenship to those being denied in any degree "that vital recognition of human dignity, the equal protection of the laws." It has learned that, by and large, the problem is a racial problem.

The children and grandchildren of the waves of immigrants from the nations of Europe, reared and educated as Americans, have dispersed and strengthened our communities everywhere. Discrimination, once widespread and victimizing Americans for reasons of race, religion, national origin, and economics, is now largely concentrated upon our 18 million Negro citizens.

In part this is the old problem of the vicious circle. Slavery, economic discrimination, and second-class citizenship have demoralized a considerable portion of those suffering these injustices, and the consequent demoralization has then been seen by others as an excuse for continuing some of the very conditions that cause the demoralization.

The fundamental interrelationships among the subjects of voting, education, and housing make it impossible for the problem to be solved by the improvement of any one factor alone. If the right to vote is secured, but there is not equal opportunity in education and housing the value of that right will be discounted by apathy and ignorance.

If compulsory discrimination is ended in public education, but children continue to be brought up in slums and restricted areas of racial concentration, the conditions for good education and good citizenship will still not obtain. If decent housing is made available to nonwhites on equal terms but their education and habits of citizenship are not raised, new neighborhoods will degenerate into slums.

The Founding Fathers were not content with voicing lofty idealism. Being eminently practical men who had risked their lives in revolution against a powerful king and growing empire, they installed the basic elements of a political system by which these ideals might be achieved in time.

Both their idealism and their practicality were put to the test at the outset. Slavery was an established institution, and slavery was inconsistent with their ideals of human freedom and dignity. Being practical men, they arrived at a compromise, which was to forbid importation of slaves after a specific future date in the hope and belief that with the supply of human chattels cut off, the institution itself would eventually wither away in the heat and light of public discussion.

That they were wrong we know now; the political machine broke down when it was called upon to deal with this issue, and our country resorted to war to settle it, perhaps needlessly.

All this serves to emphasize the fact that the Negro problem has been with us from the beginning of our country, and that our success or failure in dealing with it has always been and continues to be the measure of our success or failure in the making practical reality fit our theoretical idealism.

All of our history, speaking generally, is a reflection of our constant concern that we have not as yet achieved the ideals to which we officially and traditionally aspire. This accounts, as Myrdal points out, for our propensity to self-criticism, which sometimes amazes and pains our friends and gives aid and comfort to our enemies.

But viewed in retrospect, our history is one of great overall progress toward the idealistic goals which we hold constantly before our eyes.

Take as one example the extension of the voting franchise. At the end of the Revolution we were a Nation of approximately 3,250,000. More than 1 million were not free—they were slaves or bondsmen. Of that 2 million free citizens, not more than 120,000 were allowed to vote. The others were disenfranchised because they were women, or did not own property of sufficient value, or for other reasons.

Today, the right to vote in most of America is almost universal. Property qualifications have been eliminated save for token poll taxes, and women have won the right to the ballot. Indeed, the lag in Negro voting in some sections of the South is almost the sole remaining disfiguring blot on a record of which to be proud. By this margin do we still fall short of our goal.

LOAN TO EGYPT BY WORLD BANK

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I was greatly shocked by the recent decision of the World Bank to extend a loan to Egypt for the improvement of the Suez Canal, despite the fact that that nation is violating its undertakings to maintain free transit in that canal by intercepting ships and cargoes bound for Israel.

I sought to warn the President of the Bank, the Honorable Eugene Black, against any such decision in advance, as did numerous other Members of Congress. The inappropriateness of our Government's supporting such a decision by the Bank in the face of the assurances by President Eisenhower in 1957, is just as obvious as the inappropriateness of the World Bank, as an agency of the United Nations, granting this assistance to a nation which is acting contrary to the basic principles for the administration of the Suez Canal laid down by the United Nations.

One new demonstration of popular opposition to this course in our country and an appeal to the President to take action to reverse such obstruction by Egypt is contained in a resolution adopted by the Pioneer Women of Chicago on January 6, 1960. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of this resolution, which so succinctly and strongly states the position which I believe our Government should take.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas after Israel's withdrawal from Sinai in response to requests from the United States, President Eisenhower said on February 20, 1957, "We should not assume that, if Israel withdraws (from Sinai), Egypt will prevent Israeli shipping from using the Suez Canal or the Gulf of Aquaba. If, unhappily, Egypt does hereafter violate the armistice agreement or other international obligations, then this should be dealt with firmly by the Society of Nations"; and

Whereas President Nasser of Egypt has flouted international law and has defied the United Nations Security Council resolution of September 1, 1951, calling upon Egypt "to terminate the restrictions on the passage of international commercial shipping and goods through the Suez Canal, wherever bound"; and

Whereas Egypt has broken its pledge in 1956 to abide by the six principles governing the operation of the nationalized Suez Canal; and

Whereas President Nasser has violated the promise that he made to United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold in July 1959, to allow transit for ships and cargoes if they were not Israel-owned at the time of their passage through the canal, and has ordered the seizing on December 18, 1959,

of a Greek ship bound from Haifa, to Djibouti with a cargo of cement, and

Whereas, we note that our country continues to offer financial aid and political support to the United Arab Republic, thus whetting its appetite for fresh intrigues in the Middle East and Africa, threatening the lifeline and security of Israel, democracy's surest bulwark and ally in the Middle East, and posing new dangers to the peace of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Pioneer Women of Chicago assembled this day of January 6, 1960, do call upon President Eisenhower to remember his sacred pledge of February 1957, that any further attempts of Egypt to block Israel's shipping in the Suez Canal "should be dealt with firmly by the Society of Nations" and to initiate such steps immediately in American policy and practice, as well as seek such measure in the United Nations as may be necessary to halt President Nasser's continued violation of his own pledged word and international law. We are persuaded that firm action by our own President will introduce a new note of international morality in the problems of the Middle East and that this will advance his quest and ours for peace and justice.

Mrs. Samuel Kaplan.
EVELYN P. KAPLAN

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I mention this issue as one of some urgency today because the press reports that U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold is going to Cairo tomorrow, January 21, to renew his efforts to persuade President Nasser to lift the Suez Canal blockade against cargoes bound for Israel.

In this appeal I hope the Secretary General will have the warmest and most vigorous support of our Government and of the other member nations. I am confident that Members of the Senate from both parties believe such action essential.

The decision to grant the World Bank loan has been made. President Nasser has thus been granted the assistance of the U.N. in his plans for the Suez. Surely it is now timely to ask for some reciprocity from him and to urge him to abide by the U.N. decisions and his own promises of free transit in the canal.

The legal bargaining position of the United Nations is weakened by the World Bank's decision. But the moral bargaining position with the nation now assured of United Nations help is stronger than ever. I earnestly hope our Government will not lose this opportunity to advance the prospects for peace in the Middle East.

In addition, Mr. President, the interesting newsletter Near East Report, which comments upon American policy in the Near East, edited by Mr. I. L. Kenen, in its January 15, 1960, issue includes an editorial which raises a basic question all Members of Congress must face in connection with the mutual security program when it comes before the Congress this year. If a nation persistently flouts the decisions of the United Nations and uses boycotts, blockades, new arms from the Soviet Union and a proclaimed state of war against one of its neighbors to unsettle the peace and threaten the stability of nations in the Middle East, should our extension of assistance to such a nation be continued or accompanied by some conditions that seek to end these violations of United Nations obligations and policies which endanger the peace and security of the world?

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Near East Report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEUTRALISM OR COLLECTIVE SECURITY—WHICH?

President Eisenhower's state of the Union message stressed the need to help the underdeveloped countries whose poverty and stagnation provided a drab background for his epochal journey to Asia and Africa. But this responsibility may be shared. The administration is calling on prospering European nations whom we have helped in the past to join and lend a hand.

New questions are being raised on Capitol Hill. Should we proffer aid without conditions?

Within recent years, a shibboleth has gained credence. It has been argued that it is a mistake to put strings on our aid because new nations are suspicious, sensitive and easily offended. They want to be neutral. They will reject our good offerings if they suspect these impinge on their independence and sovereignty and convert them into satellites.

This natural aspiration of new governments to be free in the full sense of the word must be recognized. But freedom is never to be confused with license. While the free world must respect the wishes of these new countries to cast their votes in the United Nations as their own conscience and judgment dictate, this does not mean we must shut our eyes to neutralist and negative policies which are devoid of any sense of responsibility to the international community.

The concept of neutralism has no special virtue to recommend it. It is accepted all too easily by inexperienced nations which fail to grasp the full implications of collective security as the very condition of their survival. (But let their own borders be menaced and they are the first to deplore neutralism in others. One must draw a line between the policy of "nonidentification" which attempts to appraise international problems on their merits without a bloc precommitment, and the "neutralism" which measures issues by the egocentric criterion of self-interest and ignores duty to international law and to world cooperation and peace.

These questions are asked on Capitol Hill because the administration and Congress have been receiving many protests as a result of the $56.5 million loan to the UAR to improve the Suez Canal despite the misuse of that international waterway as an instrument of blockade and aggression. It has been argued that the World Bank is an economic instrument and could not reject the loan on political grounds—that political action is for governments, not banking institutions. Such an argument has naturally directed attention to our own Government, which is offering large assistance to the UAR for other projects without questioning its illegal policies.

More and more Congressmen are coming to believe that they must now write conditions into the mutual security program if it is to preserve the concepts of mutuality and security.

They ask:

Should we insist on freedom of the seas and respect for the prestige and authority of the United Nations?

Should we unconditionally grant aid to nations which: Carry on boycotts and blockades against neighbors? Acquire arms from the Soviet Union? Defy U.N. Security Council decisions? Proclaim themselves in a state of war in contravention of the U.N. Charter?

It may be old fashioned to suggest that moral considerations should motivate our foreign policy. But the first half of this century has taught us that material and security interests are jeopardized—and millions of lives are inevitably squandered—when nations affect neutralist isolationism and turn their backs on collective security.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCE CHARGES IN CONNECTION WITH EXTENSIONS OF CREDIT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am encouraged by the widespread and favorable response to the introduction of S. 2755, a bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit.

One of the most pointed and discerning comments on the bill was made by Mr. Edward P. Morgan on the American Broadcasting network, on January 11, 1960. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Morgan's comment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Never give a sucker an even break," that bumblingly belligerent and craftily calculating comedian W. C. Fields used to say. On the theory, presumably, that the term sucker and customer are synonymous, a number of merchants have religiously tried to follow Fields' advice in building their business practices. This category of sharpies has been thinned down gradually by the pressure and protests of ethical competitors, by legislation on various levels and perhaps even by some added discernment on the part of the buying public. But one area which has yielded less readily to treatment is that involving interest rates and purchases on the installment plan. One of the economic experts of Capitol Hill, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, thinks it is time to plunge into this labyrinth of deceptive double charges and straighten it out with some clear labeling.

Last Thursday, with active liberal encouragement in both Houses, Douglas introduced in the Senate a bill to require that consumers be given true and lucid figures about interest rates and finance charges when borrowing money or buying things on credit.

"In too many instances today," DOUGLAS said, "the consumer who signs a document that places him in debt would have to be a lawyer to understand the fine print that spells out his rights and liabilities; and he would have to be an accountant or an expert in higher mathematics to compute the cost of the credit in simple annual terms. Altogether too often he is deceived into paying a higher cost for credit than he has been led to expect by the huckstering and fast-talking salesmen."

As the Wall Street Journal pointed out in a report on the Douglas bill, a small loan company which now tells a borrower simply that the interest rate on his loan is three percent per month would, under such a labeling act, have to specify that the annual interest rate might amount to 36 percent. And, a mortgage company would have to explain to the man getting a 6 percent home loan that finance charges on a $20,000 house might exceed $10,000 over a 25-year period.

What all this amounts to, in effect, is disclosure, something the public is coming

more and more to expect. DOUGLAS himself was a prime force behind recently enacted laws requiring full accounting of employee welfare funds, whether union—or company run. One of the basic functions of the controversial new labor reform act is to bring to light the disposition of all union funds. It seems likely that when the full story of payola in broadcasting comes out remedial legislation will follow to prevent the practice of dispensing hidden payments for the plugging of certain products. The Illinois Senator reasons that there is a kind of payola in hidden interest rates and finance charges and he is hopeful that the current fashion for disclosure will provide an added impetus for his bill.

It is interesting to note, in this connection, that a bill on basic auto price labeling sailed through Congress in the summer of 1958 and there is no indication that it has had any adverse effect on the sale of cars; indeed the New York Times says today the prospect is bright in Detroit for record sales in 1960.

There is some speculation that the Douglas measure may gain support as an alternative to outright Federal controls on consumer credit which has swollen to what some economists consider alarming proportions, and/or that it might provide a qualified counter to high interest rates. DOUGLAS calculates that what consumers owe now on installment purchases, car loans, personal loans, mortgages and the like totes up to a staggering $175 billion in personal debt. Consumer credit, he argues, has been transformed from a "financing mechanism to a merchandising tool, where loans are disguised as sales, to the detriment of our economy." One theory is that if the public were aware of how much these loans cost it would ease off on borrowing. This may or may not be true but if the buying public has been played for a sucker in the past I suspect it was largely because it wasn't getting an even break with clearly labeled facts.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the pending amendment, as modified. Perhaps the modified amendment is not quite as objectionable as was the amendment when it was first read. Nevertheless, it is based upon the premise that a political committee which operates in only one State must file a Federal report.

We should remember that if in any State a majority of the people want to regulate the elections, and if they insist upon a certain type of reporting of expenditures, they can do so and they will do so. If we resort to the device—and certainly it is not a remedy; it does not solve anything—of transferring every problem to Washington, we do a disservice to the public.

The reports which are filed under the existing law are seldom referred to, although it is true that they may receive some publicity that is helpful in nature.

However, today we are asked to embark upon the following course: If a group of citizens band themselves together, and if they operate in only one State, to exercise the great American privilege of taking part in self-government, the pending amendment, as modified, would require them to file reports in Washington, or else face the imposition of a criminal penalty.

Mr. President, the existing law provides that a political committee must operate in two or more States if it is to come under the required reporting provisions. We have no assurance that the mere filing of the reports will change anything. In fact, I do think it will make changes for the worse; it will cause citizens who should be interested in participating in elections to decline to do so.

The average citizen is very intelligent, but he is also busy. He might be induced to take part, in his precinct or his county, in political activity—for instance, in the raising of funds and in the holding of meetings. But if, in addition, he were required to make Federal reports in regard to those activities, or else take the chance of criminal prosecution, fewer and fewer of the people would take part in such activities.

Certainly the objective of the election laws should be to have more and more citizens participate in the elections and the campaigns; and I think that would be good for the country. I also believe it would be wonderful if more people were to contribute to political campaigns, so as to spread the base, and if more people were to give smaller amounts.

But whenever we add to the reporting requirement—and I may say that the amendment, as modified, relates to the reporting requirement—fewer and fewer people will participate in the elections and in the campaigns; and the tendency of such a provision will be to drive campaign financing underground, instead of placing it out in the open, so more people will take part, and so their neighbors will know what is going on, and so the States will have absolute power, if they wish to exert it, to regulate and to require the making of reports.

On the other hand, if we confuse the picture, we discourage citizens from taking part in campaigns and elections and in financing them; and the effects of such discouragement would be bad.

Mr. President, perhaps this bill will not become law. If we add too many provisions here, the bill will not meet all the objections which will be raised both in this body and in the other one, and it will not be approved in conference, and will not become law. Certainly it will not become law in time to affect very many, if any, of the primaries in the country.

Mr. President, the Senate should reject these amendments. The bill as it stands is a compromise; but it is fair to everyone. It raises the limit on the amounts which can lawfully be spent; and that should be done. After all, in view of the high cost, today, of all things, it is not possible, in conducting a campaign, to remain within the present limits. So that situation leads to the formation of many committees or to practices which are not the best.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will leave the bill as it is, and will pass this needed legislation.

On the other hand, to insist upon adding these extreme amendments, which are of doubtful value, will be to insist upon having no legislation of this sort.

Mr. President, I favor the enactment of legislation in this field. Therefore, I expect to oppose this confusing amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I know that sometimes legislation seems to be delayed because the Congress is persuaded to accept something less than the best or something less than what should be provided. I also recognize the validity of the argument that, under modern conditions, elections are expensive, and that in view of the great increase in the number of radio stations and television stations, considerable amounts of money must be expended in order to conduct a campaign for election to Federal office.

The raising of the limits on the amount of money a candidate may spend is a commendable objective of the bill. But, Mr. President, that, of itself, hardly would entitle the bill to be called a clean elections bill.

If this measure is to be a clean elections bill, it seems to me it should be fortified by means of provisions which would contribute to public knowledge of the sources of the funds employed for the election of candidates.

I suggested to the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] that he increase the amount which would be the dividing line between reporting and nonreporting; and I proposed that the amount be increased from $1,000 to $2,500, because I thought the latter figure probably was a little more realistic, and because its use would simplify the situation for a committee which might spend money for the campaigns of several candidates.

But if a committee is going to spend as much as $2,500 in advocacy of the election or nomination of one candidate to Congress—to either the Senate or the House of Representatives—or if a committee is going to attempt to influence the selection of electors for President and Vice President, certainly the people have a right to know who is providing the money for those expenditures. That is all this bill will do, so far as I know.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate very much the comments my learned friend has made in regard to the bill.

Does not he agree that instead of driving people out of political activity, the regulation of a multitude of committees formed within a State would tend to bring more people to have an active interest in politics, because then they would know the sources of some of the contributions, and they could judge accordingly; and the people would not feel—as so many do now, as evidenced by the relatively small percentage of the people who vote in our great national elections—a sense of frustration—in other words, that, after all, the Government of the country is in other hands, that someone else is pulling the strings behind the scenes, that contributions are being made for the purpose of influ-

encing the elections, and that the people of the country never know the sources of the contributions, and never know how the committees which make the collections function, or, indeed, never know who the members of the committees are.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is my feeling and opinion about the matter. I believe the passage of the bill, with the provisions it contains and the amendments with which it has been modified, will increase the confidence of the public and more people will be willing to engage in politics. They will not have the feeling that perhaps things are being controlled from behind the scenes. The record will be open.

I certainly believe in public participation. I want the public generally, and on a broader scale, to take an active part in elections. If anyone hesitates to have his name included among the list of contributors for the promotion of the candidacy of some candidate for public office, the question must always arise, Why? Why? Why should anyone hesitate to let it be known that he is interested in the candidacy of somebody whom he wants to give some money for that campaign cause?

So I do not believe the objection that it may tend to discourage some contributions is of too much validity, Mr. President, for if someone does not want known his interest in a candidate and the support he is lending to him, then the question must come to mind, Why does he not want it known? What is there about his support that would make it a handicap to know that John Jones or Bill Smith was backing the candidate? If so, is not the public entitled to know about it? It seems to me the public is entitled to know the source of contributions by committees that spend $2,500 on behalf of a Federal candidate.

That is all this proposal does. For a minor or embryonic candidacy, a source might spend $500 or as much as $1,500 or $2,000, and the requirement would not apply to it, but when it gets to the point of spending as much as $2,500 to influence the election of a Federal candidate, then I believe the public is entitled to know the source of the contributions and the chairman or treasurer of the committee that is spending or distributing the funds.

Mr. MORSE. The question is on agreeing to the Hennings amendment, as modified.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the Hennings amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The vote will be on the Hennings amendment, which is at the desk, identified as "1–13–60–D," as modified. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent on official business in Latin America on behalf of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee studying economic conditions.

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—53

Aiken	Hartke	Martin
Allott	Hennings	Monroney
Anderson	Humphrey	Morse
Bartlett	Jackson	Moss
Bible	Javits	Mundt
Brunsdale	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Byrd, W. Va.	Keating	Muskie
Cannon	Kefauver	Neuberger
Carroll	Kennedy	Pastore
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Prouty
Clark	Lausche	Randolph
Cooper	Long, Hawaii	Smith
Dodd	Long, La.	Symington
Douglas	McCarthy	Wiley
Gore	McGee	Williams, Del.
Green	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	Magnuson	Young, Ohio
Hart	Mansfield	

NAYS—37

Beall	Fong	Robertson
Bennett	Frear	Russell
Bridges	Fulbright	Saltonstall
Bush	Goldwater	Schoeppel
Butler	Hayden	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Sparkman
Capehart	Hill	Stennis
Carlson	Holland	Talmadge
Cotton	Hruska	Thurmond
Curtis	Johnston, S.C.	Yarborough
Dirksen	Jordan	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	McClellan	
Ervin	Morton	

NOT VOTING—10

Case, N.J.	Eastland	Proxmire
Chavez	Engle	Smathers
Church	Kerr	
Dworshak	O'Mahoney	

So Mr. HENNINGS' amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. It is designated "1–13–60—G."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to have the amendment read in full?

Mr. PROUTY. In view of the fact that the amendment has been on the desks of Senators for some time, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 17, strike out lines 8 to 27, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 608. (a) Whoever, directly or indirectly, makes contributions in an aggregate amount in excess of $5,000 during any calendar year, or in connection with any campaign for nomination or election, to or on behalf of any candidate for an elective Federal office with respect to which elections are conducted within the State in which the person making the contribution resides, including the offices of President of the United States and presidential and vice presidential electors, or to or on behalf of any committee or other organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate for any such office or the success of any national political party, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"This subsection shall not apply to contributions made to or by a State or local committee or other State or local organization or to similar committees or organizations in the District of Columbia or in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or in any possession of the United States.

"(b) Whoever, directly or indirectly, makes a contribution in any amount or of any value in connection with any campaign for nomination or election, to or on behalf of any candidate for an elective Federal office with respect to which elections are not conducted within the State in which the person making the contribution resides, or to or on behalf of any committee or other organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any such candidate, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"This subsection shall not apply to contributions made to or by a State or local committee or other State or local organization or to similar committees or organizations in the District of Columbia or in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or in any possession of the United States, if such national committee or State or local committee or other State or local organization is a regularly organized adjunct of a national political party.

"(c) Whoever, directly or indirectly, makes a contribution out of funds made available to him for that purpose by another person in any amount or of any value in connection

with any campaign for nomination or election, to or on behalf of any candidate for an elective Federal office (including the offices of President of the United States and presidential and vice presidential electors), or to or on behalf of any committee or other organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate for any such office or the success of any national political party shall, if he does not disclose at the time such contribution is made, the name of the person who made such funds so available to him, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"This subsection shall not apply to contributions made by a National, State, or local committee, or other State or local organization or by similar committees or organizations in the District of Columbia or in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or in any possession of the United States, if such national committee or State or local committee or other State or local organization is a regularly organized adjunct of a national political party."

And on page 17, line 25, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)" and on page 18, line 15, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, last night I was very glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] in order that he might offer the amendment which the Senate has just approved, because I knew that that amendment, if adopted, would operate well with the provisions contained in my amendment. In other words, my amendment is fully complementary to the one which the Senate has just approved.

The bill before the Senate is a good bill as far as it goes, but in no sense can it be considered a genuine election reform law.

The committee reported bill does alter obsolete limitations on spending; it tightens up reporting requirements and it improves publicity provisions. However, it does absolutely nothing to effectively curb certain unethical practices of some special interest groups seeking to circumvent regular party channels in their attempts to influence the choice and election of candidates in several States.

While not a cure-all, the amendment I have submitted does offer a realistic method for controlling some of the more flagrant of these unethical and unhealthy practices.

Four years ago, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I introduced a bill with similar objectives. At that time, Members will recall, Congress and the public were aroused over a shocking incident related on this floor.

The bill in its present form, as amended, is a much stronger bill than the bill which first came to the floor.

I think I can also say, without fear of contradiction, that if the amendment I am proposing is adopted we shall have completed a genuine electoral reform measure.

Four years ago a representative of a private interest went into a State not his own and attempted, in a roundabout way, to make a quiet contribution of $2,500 to the forthcoming campaign for reelection of a U.S. Senator from that State. It later developed that the individual attempting to make the donation was acting on behalf of parties financially interested in the outcome of a bill then before Congress.

It is to the everlasting honor and credit of this Senator that he brought this matter so openly to the attention of the American public.

Mr. President, let the integrity of our electoral process become tainted and subject to abuse and the very bedrock of our republican form of government is endangered.

Among our American people honesty of elections is taken for granted. When we learn of an occasional dishonest election we rightfully become incensed. We can attribute this to the probity of our people generally and to the integrity of most of our candidates. It decidedly is not due to Federal laws relating to campaign contributions and expenditures. These are so loosely drawn that if they do not encourage, at least they permit, deception and dishonesty.

It is no news to Members of this body, to representatives of information media, or to the public generally that a good deal of money is required to conduct a political campaign today, and that the cost is becoming increasingly higher. Newspapers, radio and television time, and travel have become campaign necessities and must be paid for.

Unless we are to say that only rich men should become candidates for public office we must recognize the need and make provision for campaign contributions. But the public possesses a genuine concern in the amount of, the source of, the character of, and the circumstances surrounding such contributions.

Most political contributions, I sincerely believe, are made with the honest and aboveboard intention of supporting one of contending philosophies of government, or because of respect and admiration for a particular candidate. We must recognize, however, that some political contributors may have selfish aims; they may expect quid for quo. It is this type of contribution that we must be concerned with and that my amendment seeks to control.

It was the intention of the founders of our Republic and of those who came after them that every Member of Congress should owe his election to the suffrage of his constituents and that he should be answerable only to them and to his conscience for his words and deeds.

Despite this intent, certain influences exist which tend to alter our traditional pattern. Not content with limiting their representation in Congress to Senators and Members of the House from their own State, as intended by the Constitution, some individuals have participated, directly or indirectly, in the nomination and election of candidates in States other than their own.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would the Senator's amendment reach the situation I shall picture to him, and, if so, how? Suppose a man simply mails his contribution or leaves it on someone's doorstep. Would the Senator's amendment cover that kind of situation?

Mr. PROUTY. I believe that when I have concluded my prepared statement and have read a series of questions and answers, I will have answered the Senator's question to his satisfaction.

Some of these individuals to which I have referred may have been well intentioned and not motivated by selfish interest. Others, however, have had no such high-minded inspiration. Their financial contributions have been made with the hope, if not the understanding, that the candidate would cherish, protect and, if possible, advance their private, special interests.

It is my sincere conviction that citizens of one State should not meddle in the politics of another State. Certainly, they should not be permitted to influence, by contributions, the nomination or election of candidates in several States, for any reason whatsoever.

I am also firmly of the belief that no individual or group should have the right to make political contributions through a middleman. Not only does this conceal the identity of the real contributor, it also affords an opportunity for circumventing the statutory limitations relating to political contributions.

The amendment which I have offered to the bill (S. 2436), the Federal Elections Act of 1959, is not presented as a cure-all. It cannot change the minds and hearts of men with evil intent. It does, however, seek to control, in what I believe is a fair, realistic, and practical manner, the actions of their hands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont will suspend. Once more the Chair would state that the Senator from Vermont is entitled to attention, under the rules. He is deserving of being heard.

Mr. PROUTY. My proposal would prohibit any person from making a political contribution to, or on behalf of, any candidate seeking nomination or election outside the contributor's own State for the office of U.S. Senator or Representative in Congress.

There would be no prohibition, however, against contributing to presidential and vice-presidential candidates, since my proposal specifically permits contributions to, or on behalf of, candidates running in elections which are conducted within the State in which the person making the contribution resides.

Groups formed in one State, which are not affiliated with a national party, would be prohibited by my proposal from making contributions to influence the nomination or election of Senators and Representatives in other States. Of course, there would be no prohibition against activities of a local organized committee in a State making contributions so long as its activities were con-

fined to elections within the State and are in conformity with the provisions of existing law.

National, State, and local committees which are genuine adjuncts of a national political party would be exempt, under my proposal, from the prohibition against interstate political donations. There are several good reasons for this exemption:

In the first place, no national political party organization or any adjunct thereof contributes financially to candidates in State primaries or other State nomination systems. They only contribute toward the election of candidates in several States.

This exemption would result in a more extensive channeling of campaign funds through legitimate political committees; and, under the law, such committees are required to file reports of their contributions and expenditures. Other committees professing to be educational or nonpolitical in character sometimes do not consider themselves so obligated.

Another major feature of my amendment would make it a violation of law for any person to make a political contribution out of funds made available to him for that purpose without disclosing at the time the contribution is made the name of the person or persons who made such funds available.

This "who gave it" provision would be applicable to contributions made to national political parties and genuine adjuncts thereof, but would not apply to contributions made by them.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, before he leaves that paragraph?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I have been listening most attentively to the Senator's explanation of his amendment. I wish to make sure that I understand it. I recall that when Senator Bob Taft was running for reelection, which was before I was a Member of the Senate, as a citizen I was much interested in his campaign, and I remember, poor as I was, I sent him $5 toward his campaign in the State of Ohio, although I was a resident of the State of New Hampshire. If the Senator's amendment were adopted, would it preclude that being done?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator could make the contribution if he made it to an adjunct of a national political organization in Ohio.

Mr. COTTON. An adjunct of a national political party?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. This was an election campaign. It was sent, probably, to the treasurer of Senator Taft's own campaign. I had no special interest in any of the other candidates running in Ohio.

Would the Senator's amendment have precluded me if I had been wealthy enough to send Bob Taft $10,000? Could I have sent it to him under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes. I shall come to that a little later through a series of questions and answers, which I believe will bring out those points very clearly. I would much prefer not to yield further at this point until I have had an opportunity to conclude my statement and to read the series of questions and answers.

Mr. COTTON. I shall not interrupt the Senator further.

Mr. PROUTY. I am sure I will clarify the point for the Senator.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to ask just one question on that point. Would the Senator's amendment preclude the possibility of a personal contribution to the Taft-for-Senator campaign in 1944 or 1950—just to use that as an illustration?

Mr. PROUTY. It would preclude the sending of money across State lines for use in a primary campaign. It would prohibit the interstate donation of funds in a primary campaign. Theoretically such a donation could be made if some political adjunct of a national political party or local State committee wished to receive the money and turn it over to the Taft-for-Senator campaign. It could be done on that basis. Obviously political organizations of national parties are not going to contribute financially to primary campaigns.

Mr. BUSH. However, whether it be a primary or an election campaign, after the primary the Senator's amendment would prohibit a gift from out of the State to the Taft-for-Senator campaign committee directly?

Mr. PROUTY. If the Senator will be patient, I will answer all those questions a little later on in some detail. Then the Senator will have a much better understanding of what my amendment proposes to do.

Mr. BUSH. I will not delay the Senator. The Senator had already covered that point, and I merely wished to be sure that I understood the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. I shall bring out those points later.

In short, then, my amendment would accomplish two major objectives.

First, it would prohibit individuals and groups in one State from contributing to candidates who are running for the House or Senate in another State. That is a direct contribution. It would not, however, stop an individual or a group in one State from giving to a regular Republican or Democratic committee in another State.

Secondly, it would prohibit a middleman from making a contribution to a candidate for the House and Senate unless the middleman disclosed, at the time the contribution was made, who made the money available to him for the purpose of the donation.

Naturally, my amendment would not require a regular Republican or Democratic Party organization to reveal to a candidate where it got the money it is giving the candidate. Such an administrative task would be well nigh impossible to perform.

Mr. President, inasmuch as I am not a lawyer, and because I do not wish to ask the Senate to rely on my own interpretation of existing election laws, I submitted a series of hypothetical questions to the American Law Division of the Library of Congress. I might say that Mr. Samuel H. Still, who prepared the answers to these hypothetical questions concerning present statutes is a recognized authority in this field.

I shall now read the questions and answers:

Question 1: An individual in State A goes to a Republican town committee in State A and contributes $10,000 to the committee with the understanding that it will be used to further the campaign of Jones for the U.S. Senate in State B.

Question 1(a): Could he give $10,000?

Answer: Yes. By the very terms of section 608 the $5,000 limitation does "not apply to contributions made to or by a State or local committee or other State or local organization or to similar committees or organizations in the District of Columbia or any territory or possession of the United States." (18 U.S.C., sec. 608(a).) While Assistant Attorney General of the United States, Justice Tom C. Clark, wrote:

"Section 18 (18 U.S.C., sec. 608), though in term limiting to $5,000 the amount any individual may contribute to a candidate or political committee for his nomination and election, in fact restricts only the channels through which such contributions can be made since State and local committees are exempted from the application of the act. (6 Fed. Bar Journal 13 (1944).)"

Question 1(b): Would it be legal for Republican town committee in State A to give to the Jones-for-Senate committee in State B?

Answer: Yes. Section 608(a) does "not apply to contributions made to or by a State or local committee." (18 U.S.C., sec. 608(a).)

Question 1(c): Would it be legal for the Jones-for-Senate committee in State B to use the money thus received?

Answer. Yes. Section 608(a) only applies to contributions and not to expenditures or use of funds. There is no restriction under either the Corrupt Practices Act or the pertinent sections of the Hatch Act on a State or local committee unless the State or local committee is acting as an agent (bona fide) of the candidate. The phrase "indirectly" or "on one's behalf" in a criminal statute must be strictly construed. The Supreme Court of Wisconsin has held that the phrase "on his behalf" as employed in a statute limiting the amount which may be spent by or on behalf of a candidate for public office, and requiring an account of expenditures to be filed, means "by someone who acts for him [the candidate] in the sense that an agent acts for and on behalf of his principal" and if no authority, express or implied, exists, the disbursement is not made on behalf of the person sought to be charged. (State ex rel. *La Follette* v. *Kohler* ((1930) 200 Wis. 518, 228 N.W. 895), reported and annotated at 69 A.L.R. 348. The same view was taken by Senator Nye's Select Committee on Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1930–31 (72d Cong., S. Rept. No. 20; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 75, pp. 977–984).

Question 1(d): Would it be legal for the Jones-for-Senate committee in State B to give the $10,000 received from the Republican town committee in State A directly to Mr. Jones?

Answer. Yes. Under a strict interpretation of the law there would be no violation since State and local committees are exempt from the provisions of section 608(a) limiting contributions. However, since the courts have not construed this section, in order to be safe, most committees, including the political action committees of labor unions, have kept within the $5,000 limitation when making direct contributions to individual candidates for Congress.

Question 2: Would it be legal for an individual to (a) contribute to several different Jones-for-Senate committees and (b)

give more than $5,000 to any one or to a combined number of such committees?

Answer. Again it should be pointed out section 608(a) is a criminal statute carrying a penalty of $5,000 or not more than 5 years imprisonment, or both, for a violation. The section by its very terms does not apply to contributions made to or by "a State or local committee or local organization or to similar committees or organizations in the District of Columbia or in any Territory or possession of the United States." Although no lawyer would advise a client to trifle with a criminal statute, yet it is generally believed by most authorities that the prohibitions of section 608(a) are generally directed at personal contributions made directly to candidates or made to the national committees or their adjuncts such as the congressional and senatorial campaign committees and to committees operating in two or more States and do not apply to contributions made to local or State committees. (See hearings on H.R. 1167 and H.R. 433, Subcommittee on Elections, Committee on House Administration, July 19 and August 1, 1957, 85th Cong., p. 112.)

Question 3: Can an adjunct of a national party committee such as the senatorial campaign committee or House congressional campaign committee contribute more than $5,000 to a candidate for the House or Senate?

Answer: Conceivably yes. Section 608(a) is designed to limit to $5,000 individual contributions to such campaign committees but it fails to limit contributions or expenditures made by such committees. The only limitation placed on these committees are $3 million limitations placed on their total contributions received or total expenditures made by section 20 of the Hatch Act, now codified as section 609 of title 18, United States Code.

Question 3(a): Can such an adjunct of a national party contribute more than $5,000 to a Jones-for-Senate committee or Smith-for-House committee rather than to the candidate himself?

Aswer: There is no limitation on the congressional campaign committees except the $3 million calendar year overall limitation on contributions to or expenditures by such committees appearing in section 20 of the Hatch Act, codified as section 609 of title 18, United States Code. Furthermore, section 608(a) specifically exempts contributions to such committees as Jones for Senate committee.

Mr. President, I hope the questions I have just raised and answered will give you a clearer picture of the weaknesses and limitations of existing law.

I turn now to another series of prepared questions and answers which I think will bring sharply to focus the objectives of my amendment.

I read further:

Question. Under existing law, what can an individual do if he wants to influence a senatorial or congressional election outside his own State?

Answer. He can give unlimited amounts of money to further a Jones-for-Senator campaign as long as he makes his contributions to various Jones-for-Senator committees.

Question. Under the Prouty amendment, what can an individual do if he wants to influence the outcome of a congressional or senatorial election in a State other than the one in which he has a legal residence?

Answer. He cannot make contributions directly to Jones or to any Jones-for-Senator committees. He could, however, make contributions to recognized Republican or Democratic Party organizations. This would mean strengthening of major political parties and a channeling of campaign funds through regular committee channels.

Question. What effect does this proposal have on the rights of national, State, or local committees of the Republican and Democratic Parties?

Answer. The amendment takes no rights away from these regular party committees. For example, the Republican National Committee can still make a contribution to the Jones-for-Senator campaign. In fact, the position of these regular party committees from a financial standpoint would be substantially improved because if an individual in State A wanted to promote the candidacy of an individual in State B he would have to make his contribution to a regular party organization and hope that it would go to help the candidate of his choice. Thus, the obligation, if any, of the successful candidate would be to a party and not to an individual or special interest group.

Question. Suppose an organization were formed called The National Group for a More Progressive Congress. Could this national group send money to its local branches which would be used to influence the outcome of a senatorial or congressional election?

Answer. No. Because the national group would be making a contribution to a candidate for an office within a State in which the national group does not reside.

Question. How about the local branch of this "National Group for a More Progressive Congress?"

Answer. It could make contributions to the senatorial campaign being conducted within its State, but not out of funds which came from the national headquarters.

Question. Does this proposal in any way limit the amount of money an individual can give?

Answer. No. It adds no limitation on the amount of money an individual can give. It places restrictions on the individual with respect to whom and where his political contributions are made.

Question. Since the Prouty proposal would allow out-of-State groups or individuals to contribute to senatorial or congressional campaigns only through official party channels, wouldn't this mean that any contributions made to a candidate during a primary election would have to come from the candidate's own State?

Answer. Yes. In the case of primaries, all money used in the primary would have to be contributed to the candidate or his committees from sources within that State. If, for example, Smith, from State A, contributes to the Jones-for-Senator campaign in State B, there would be a violation of the law, punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both.

Question. Could an individual in State A contribute to a presidential campaign under way in State B?

Answer. Yes. Since the office for the President is "an office with respect to which elections are conducted" within every State, a person could make contributions to presidential campaigns.

Question. In existing law is there any specific prohibition which would prevent A donating to a senatorial candidate without revealing at the time of the donation the fact that B provided the funds for the donation?

Answer. No.

Question. What change would the Prouty amendment make in this situation?

Answer. Under the Prouty proposal, if A did not reveal at the time he gave the money to the senatorial candidate the name of the person who made the funds available to him, he could be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I call to the attention of the distinguished Senator the fact that in my State there are hundreds—perhaps thousands—of fine people who have their residence in Vermont or other States and live there in the summer, or live there more than half the year, but also have their winter homes in Florida. Is it the intention of the distinguished Senator, by his amendment, to prevent persons in such a situation from showing an interest in Florida by making contributions in the regular, legal way, which must be shown in the way now required by State law as contributions, to the campaign funds of candidates for the U.S. Senate or House of Representatives?

Mr. PROUTY. In my judgment, that is a prerogative and right which belongs exclusively to the citizens of the Senator's great State. I do not believe that anyone outside the State of Florida or the State of Vermont has a right to go into a State not his own to try to influence the citizens or legal voters of that State in their choice of the candidates to represent them in Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the candor of the Senator, but I simply cannot agree with him, because I think a citizen in the situation I have described has a proper and understandable interest in the type of representation which Florida—my State—should have.

One more question: As the Senator from Vermont knows, I have relatives in Virginia and West Virginia. Some of them, for family reasons, have from time to time contributed to my campaign funds, always modestly, and the amounts have always been shown in my campaign contribution reports. Do I understand that such contributions would be precluded under the amendment of the distinguished Senator?

Mr. PROUTY. Such contributions could be made only if they were made through, for example, the Democratic State Committee in the State of Florida. They could not be made directly.

Mr. HOLLAND. These contributions are made for primary races. Of course, party contributions are not made in primary races, because in those races I will be a candidate, as I have always been in the past, against other members of my party. It seems to me that the distinguished Senator by his amendment would preclude the natural expression of interest, concern, and support by the relatives of a candidate in the primary for the Senate or House of Representatives. I do not believe such a provision should be engrafted into Federal law.

Mr. PROUTY. That is not the problem to which my amendment is directed; it is directed toward outside interests, who have no personal concern with what goes on within a State. Such interests may be trying to influence the election within that State of someone who may be susceptible to their wishes and interests after his election.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the frankness of the distinguished Senator. I am grateful for his allowing me to interrupt him. However, it seems to me that his amendment, cutting squarely across the lines of the natural interest of

relatives and the natural interest of people who have part-time homes in their adoptive State, such as is so often the case in my State, and in other States which I see represented in the Chamber, would be entirely unrealistic, so I shall regretfully have to oppose the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Florida that a great many summer visitors come to Vermont, throughout the State; and we like to have them there. But unless they are permanent residents and legal voters, I do not believe it is their right to try to determine the choice of the people of Vermont with respect to their representatives in the House of Representatives or in the Senate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to have the Senator from Vermont make clear for me, if he can—because it is not clear now—whether his amendment applies only to primaries, or whether it also applies to the general elections.

Mr. PROUTY. Under the provisions of the amendment, money can be sent to a State to be used in a general election; but the money must be contributed to an adjunct, State or local, of a national political organization.

Mr. GOLDWATER. So the amendment would apply to a general election, as well as to a primary, would it?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes. Under the provisions of the amendment, a person outside of a particular State could not contribute directly to the campaign of a candidate in that State; but such a person could contribute to a State committee or to a local committee; and, in turn, that committee could turn over the money to the candidate, if that were wished.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to ask a practical question in regard to a matter about which I happen to know something, inasmuch as I am the chairman of a campaign committee: Suppose a prospective contributor did not wish to contribute money to a committee, but wished to give the money directly to a person who was running for office; and suppose the prospective contributor refused, in fact, to contribute the money to a committee. In that event, what would be the situation, under this amendment?

Mr. PROUTY. I believe such a person could give the money to the committee, and could request that the money be turned over to the candidate of his choice.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the amendment of the Senator from Vermont make clear that that could be done?

Mr. PROUTY. I think it does make that clear.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HRUSKA in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I also wish to ask a question which goes to the constitutionality of this amendment; and I wonder whether the Senator from Vermont has considered this point: It has long been my understanding that a Senator does not represent a particular State, but, instead, represents the interests of the United States as a whole. If that be true—and according to my reading of the intent of the writers of the Constitution, and according to all I have been taught on that subject, it is true—it is perfectly natural for a resident of Vermont to have an interest in the election of a Senator from the State of Arizona, or vice versa, or to have an interest in the election of a Senator from any other State. I believe that candidates for election to the House of Representatives also would be made subject to the provisions of this measure, because they, too, under the constitutional intent, as I understand it, represent the entire Nation, as well as the people of their particular districts. But I am fearful that if we were to use the approach the Senator from Vermont proposes, we would be treading very dangerously upon the constitutional intent. Will the Senator from Vermont comment on that point?

Mr. PROUTY. Of course, as the Senator from Arizona well knows, I am not a lawyer. However, I anticipated that this question might be raised; so, if the Senator from Arizona will bear with me, I should like to quote the Constitution and a leading authority on this and related points.

First, Mr. President, I wish to call attention to article I, section 4, of the U.S. Constitution, reading as follows:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof—

But there is also the following qualification—

> but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Those words in the Constitution make it perfectly clear that the manner in which elections are conducted is of concern to Congress and may be regulated by Congress.

A comprehensive Federal statute, enacted shortly after the Civil War, outlawed a number of types of fraudulent and corrupt practices. That statute was held invalid in part, as it applied to municipal elections; but it was otherwise considered to be a constitutional exercise of the authority conferred by the Constitution.

Edward Corwin, the constitutional expert, points out that the National Government has a right to regulate primary elections conducted under State law for nomination of Members of Congress, where such primary is made by State law "an integral part of the procedure of choice, or where, in fact, the primary effectively controls the choice."

His viewpoint relies, in part, on the Supreme Court decision in the case of *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U.S. 299, 318), to which reference has been made previously during the debate on this bill.

Edward S. Corwin, a noted constitutional authority, who edited for the Library of Congress the annotated version of the Constitution, to which all lawyers refer, indicates in that volume that a State may not add to the qualifications prescribed by the Constitution for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. He points out that both the House and the Senate have seated Members who were elected during their terms of office as State judges, despite the provision of State constitutions which purport to bar the election of judges to any office under the State or the United States during such term.

The right to vote for Representatives and U.S. Senators is derived from the Federal Constitution.

Furthermore, it can be said that a Representative or a Senator takes an oath of allegiance, not to his State, but to the United States.

As the Senator from Arizona knows, the opinion I have just read is not my personal opinion; it is the opinion of some noted constitutional authorities.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But I believe my question has not been completely answered. I still cling to what I have long believed to be the intent of the framers of the Constitution—namely, that interest in the U.S. Senate is nationwide, and is not to be confined within the boundaries of any one State.

Because of that long-held belief on my part in regard to the intent of the framers of the Constitution, I have always felt, and I still do, that it is perfectly proper for me—if I wish to do so—to contribute money to the efforts of a candidate for election to the U.S. Senate from any State in the Union.

This point relates to one which previously was raised by my friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, when he asked the Senator from Vermont whether, under this amendment, the efforts made for the reelection of the late Senator Bob Taft, in connection with which efforts funds were solicited throughout the Nation, would be permissible.

Mr. PROUTY. Only if the funds were contributed through recognized adjuncts of a national political party.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In that event, the "Bob Taft for Senator" campaign, which certainly had national interest which extended across all State lines, would be prohibited, under the terms of the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, would it?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Once again I might remind the Senator from Vermont that—particularly in these days, when many people, in both parties, question whether they owe allegiance to any particular party, but, instead, look upon themselves as independents—we might, as actually is the case, and we find this situation existing in both parties, that

find individuals would object to contributing to any party; instead, they would wish to contribute to an individual candidate. Does the Senator from Vermont not feel that is a constitutional right of the people of the country?

Mr. PROUTY. I do not feel that I am the most qualified person to argue what is provided under the Constitution.

However, in reference to the reelection of the late Senator Taft, of Ohio, I may point out that, in that connection, anyone outside of the State of Ohio could, under the provisions of this amendment, have contributed to a State committee or to a local committee, which could have used in behalf of the reelection of Senator Taft the money thus contributed.

In that case, money poured in from many groups all over the country, including labor organizations.

I believe it is the right of the people of Ohio, or any other State, to determine, particularly in the primary elections, whom they want to represent them in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GOLDWATER. At this time I should like to refer to a point the Senator from Vermont raised a little while ago: For instance, if I wished to contribute to the Senator's campaign in Vermont, when the time for his reelection campaign came, could I do so by sending my check to the Vermont Republican organization, but with the specific provision that the money was to be used for the reelection of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. PROUTY. I believe so, provided the Senator from Arizona specified that he wanted the money spent in that manner.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I believe the amendment of the Senator from Vermont is a very dangerous one, although I do not wish to labor the point.

I completely understand the intentions of the Senator from Vermont, and I believe they are very honorable.

But I believe the amendment impinges on the Constitution; and, if I correctly understand the last remarks the Senator from Vermont made, I think that in many cases the amendment could result in depriving a candidate of funds which justly would be his.

Both of us know that State committees are not always completely friendly to candidates. Therefore, if we deprive a candidate of his normal means of obtaining funds with which to run for election we shall cause great danger, and in speaking on that point I speak from the practical point of view.

Mr. PROUTY. However, I feel certain that the Senator from Arizona will agree that in a general election a Republican State organization always will support the nominee of the Republican Party or the candidate of the Republican Party, regardless of whether the organization supported that candidate in the primary.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Well, I cannot agree 100 percent with that, but I can assure the Senator that this business of raising money for candidates is not the easy thing it is portrayed to be. I have been in this activity for some time, and I must report it is difficult, particularly when we have to go through party channels to get money and both parties have trouble raising money. When certain candidates whose philosophies agree with those of the people, and who are able, are running, persons or groups should be able to give money in any amount to that particular candidate. I think the Senator will find in his own State there is as much money raised by a candidate as is raised by the party itself. I repeat, I think this is a dangerous step to take, although I do not by that statement condemn the Senator from Vermont, because I know his intentions are completely honorable. I wish I could agree with him, but in this case I must disagree.

Mr. PROUTY. I do not feel that if I wished to, and certainly I do not have that desire, I would have or should have the right to go into the State of Arizona, if the Senator from Arizona were engaged in a bitter primary fight, and contribute to his campaign or his opponent's campaign. I think that is a matter to be handled purely within the State, and the voters of Arizona should make that choice, without outside influence. We know that matter has been one of the great difficulties of the past. Outside interests have gone into a State and have tried to nominate candidates of either party not because they were interested in the least with respect to the State in question, but because they were or thought they were going to gain something if those particular candidates were elected. It has happened in the past only too frequently. I am sure no one approves of it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. One more question comes to my mind, because the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], is presently sitting behind me. The Senator from Vermont will recall that the Senator from South Carolina was elected by a write-in vote. He had no party backing at all. Under the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from South Carolina could not have received contributions from the outside and he could not have received contributions from either party, because neither party was backing him. What would the Senator say about a case of that kind?

Mr. PROUTY. That is an intrastate affair. Money could be raised from the local committees.

Mr. GOLDWATER. From citizens in the State.

Mr. PROUTY. From citizens in the State or from local committees.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Certainly, the Senator from South Carolina in this case was not running as a Republican, although I wish he were a Republican. He did not believe in the Democratic Party. He did not believe in the principles of the Democratic Party. He ran in his own right as a candidate. He could then not get money from normal sources. I had a great interest in the Senator's election. I supplied a little bit of money for his campaign. I do not think he ever knew it. I felt it to be in the best interests of the country to have in the Senate a man like the Senator from South Carolina, and I felt it within my constitutional rights to send a very nominal check for his campaign.

I would not want to feel, in any coming election, that as an American citizen, I would be precluded from helping candidates run for office from either party, or from outside of either party, with whose philosophy I agreed. I am afraid this amendment will destroy that right which I feel is mine under the Constitution.

Mr. PROUTY. It would not alter the right insofar as a general election is concerned. It would alter it, for all practical purposes, in a primary campaign.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Now, in a primary campaign, I can see some argument for the amendment, but the Senator from Vermont earlier said that this amendment would apply to general elections, also. I have been trying to get that point clear. Let us assume that a primary is over and Candidate Smith is the nominee of the party; he is in the general election. Does the Senator's amendment apply to the general election?

Mr. PROUTY. It would be possible for the Senator to contribute funds to a candidate in a State other than his own by contributing the funds through the Republican or Democratic political parties or committees. The Senator could not make a direct contribution to the candidate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But I would have to indicate when I made that contribution that my check was for Candidate Smith?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes, if the Senator wanted it used for that specific purpose.

Mr. GOLDWATER. We have to recognize the fact that a party may not want to do that. Would the party be bound to use the check for that purpose?

Mr. PROUTY. No, I do not think the party or committee would have to accept that check for that purpose if it did not want to. I assume that in a general election the Democratic or Republican committees or parties would go all out to elect their candidates.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish I could agree that the Democratic or Republican Party wholeheartedly back candidates of their party. Unfortunately, they do not always do so.

Mr. PROUTY. They may not be happy with the selection, but, generally speaking, I think the parties are going to support their candidates, when the chips are down, in a general election.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a statement and perhaps questions?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. I want to say that I appreciate very much the Senator's interest in bringing the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 up to date by making the ceiling as well as the publicity and reporting provisions more realistic. In the light of the Senator's conscientious desire to contribute to the bill, I have undertaken to analyze his proposal. If I make any misstatements in connection with my understanding of it, I would appreciate my friend from Vermont correcting me.

I would at the outset like to say that I regret the Senator's amendment was not presented a little earlier, so that we

might have given it some more study; but may I ask him this question: Suppose in the bill, the Elections Act of 1959—State committees, by which I mean legally constituted committees within the State, within the respective or several political parties, are not required to report—what would the Senator's answer be to the suggestion that, there being no reporting requirements as relating to official State committees for parties, it would open the door to the funneling off of funds not otherwise subject to reporting under amendments previously adopted and under other terms of the bill?

Mr. PROUTY. I will state to the Senator my understanding.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not want to misunderstand the Senator. I want to do everything I can to try to clarify my own understanding of the amendment the Senator has offered.

Mr. PROUTY. I assume that under the Senator's amendment which was agreed to this afternoon such committees would be required to report, generally speaking.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator would say, then, that there would be no real or present danger, under that interpretation, as to any money being channeled in other directions for the benefit of specific candidates, without it being reported?

Mr. PROUTY. I would think not.

Mr. HENNINGS. As I understand the able Senator from Vermont, the amendment would change 18 United States Code 608 as reported in the bill before us, in that it would modify subsection (a) and enact new subsections (b) and (c).

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. It would change subsections (b) and (c) to subsections (d) and (e), respectively. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. Therefore, subsection (a) would reenact the existing provision contained in the present Corrupt Practices Act, on the $5,000 limitation to individual candidates or political committees; is that true?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes, that is correct, so far as intrastate contributions are made.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is aware that we will undertake to raise the limit to $10,000, but the Senator's amendment would contemplate that insofar as these contributions are concerned the amount would be $5,000 and not $10,000; am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. PROUTY. In case the Senator's amendment is adopted, I would have no objection to changing the figure in my amendment to $10,000, so that it would be in accord with his amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator for his clarification.

Now, in my attempt to understand the Senator's amendment and to analyze it, I believe the modification removes all limitations on out-of-State contributions. However, it must be read in conjunction with subsection (b), which makes it a criminal offense to make any direct or indirect contribution in the campaign for nomination or election outside the State of the contributor's residence.

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is the intent of the Senator's amendment, as he contemplates it.

The able Senator from Vermont would also provide that only committees which are committees of the regularly organized national political parties are exempt?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct, so far as subsections (a) and (b) are concerned.

Mr. HENNINGS. If I may detain the Senator a moment or two longer, I should like to understand a bit more about the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. I wish to correct my last answer. That is correct insofar as subsection (b) is concerned.

Mr. HENNINGS. Insofar as subsection (b) is concerned?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Vermont has made a very able presentation of his case. The Senator is, of course, well aware of the fact that the language makes it a criminal offense to make contributions in any campaign for nomination or election without disclosing the name of the principal, if the contributor acts as an agent, but party committees are exempt from this requirement.

Mr. PROUTY. Are they, under the Senator's amendment which was agreed to earlier?

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the Senator agree on that point, that they are?

Mr. PROUTY. I will say to the Senator that contributions to national committees, for example, would have to be disclosed, but not the sources of contributions made by them.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator.

I will say that the Senator's amendment, in principle, has been the subject of much concern not only to me but also to others who are very much interested in the process in which we are now engaged, in the improving of the election machinery to provide fuller participation and greater publicity and to inhibit certain other excesses in the elective process.

I will say to the Senator from Vermont, as has been set forth, there is a prohibition against contributing across State lines. What would the Senator say as to that being possibly violative of the guarantees of the first amendment? I was absent from the floor for about 5 minutes, because I had to make a telephone call, and I do not know whether the Senator adverted to that or not.

Mr. PROUTY. Well, I think that all centers around the right of the Congress to regulate the election proceedings. I am not qualified to argue a constitutional point of law with the distinguished Senator, because I am not a lawyer.

Mr. HENNINGS. I believe the Senator is very modest in his statement. I do not know exactly what is required to fulfill the capacity of a so-called constitutional lawyer, except that one may so proclaim himself and hope that some may believe he is, after he so advertises.

There is one thing which bothers me about this matter, which has been expressed to me by other Senators, and I think stated on the floor. That is the question of constitutionality, as the proposal relates to the first amendment, since national elections are a matter of principal interest to the citizens of every State, wherever the citizens may be domiciled or, indeed, wherever their places of residence may be. I am sure the Senator is competent enough as a lawyer to be well aware of the distinction between "residence" and "domicile."

Although a person resides in one State he may have exclusive business interests in another State or in several States. Even where there may be no direct economic interest, some relatives or close associates may have their residences in or carry their businesses in other States. As has been suggested, citizens may have residence in one State but also maintain permanent voting residence in another State.

Such citizens might wish to support candidates of their choice by making contributions to the candidates or to the political parties of that State. How would the Senator's amendment relate to that, in the Senator's belief?

Mr. PROUTY. Such persons would have to contribute to a regularly organized adjunct of one of the two national political parties.

Mr. HENNINGS. But they would not be allowed to contribute in any other State? I think that has been firmly and clearly established by the Senator from Vermont. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. PROUTY. Well, they can contribute in any State, but only through the regular party channels.

Mr. HENNINGS. Only within the State of residence?

Mr. PROUTY. Oh, no.

Mr. HENNINGS. No?

Mr. PROUTY. No. They can contribute to a Republican or to a Democratic committee in another State. That money would be turned over to the candidate.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sure there is no question about that, and I spoke of it earlier. They may not contribute to an individual candidate?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. In any State except the State where they hold residence?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. I assume the Senator defines "residence" as we generally understand it to be, which is the place to which a person intends to return?

Mr. PROUTY. I would be willing to say "domicile," if that is a more appropriate legal term.

Mr. HENNINGS. "Domicile" and "residence" are distinct.

Mr. PROUTY. Wherever the person lives, or wherever he votes.

Mr. HENNINGS. They are distinct, as the Senator knows.

Mr. PROUTY. I believe that the place where he votes would be the controlling factor.

Mr. HENNINGS. We may reside in Washington as Senators, but our

domiciles are in the States whence we come. I am not attempting to draw too fine a distinction.

Mr. PROUTY. I think perhaps the criterion is the place where the person is a legal voter.

Mr. HENNINGS. Wherever the person has a legal residence.

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. At the present time the practice of interstate contributions and expenditures is one of the most important ways of financing our elections. I do not know to what extent the Senator has studied the question, but I do him the credit of assuming that he has given it a great deal of serious consideration and thought, because he is of that character and nature.

Mr. PROUTY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HENNINGS. It seems to me that it is doubtful, so far as the design is concerned, whether we should exempt from the prohibition only national parties. Such a provision might tend to freeze the existing party organizations and make it difficult for other parties or other party groups or factions to arise within a State. Would that be within the Senator's contemplation?

Mr. PROUTY. In subsection (b) all elements of the party are exempt.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield briefly?

Mr. PROUTY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate the Senator's indulgence and patience.

Without subsection (b), the modification of subsection (a) so as to limit to $5,000 contributions to individual candidates or political committees would seem to be without substance.

One thing that disturbs me is that it also runs contrary to a proposed amendment to the bill, which provides for a $10,000 overall limitation. The Senator has already indicated that he would be willing to raise his limitation from $5,000 to $10,000. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. I believe that at first glance the spirit of the Senator's amendment is to bring into the open the real contributor of political funds. But the thing that bothers me is the handling of the situation by way of a simple amendment, without a thorough study of the problem and its scope, and the effect such a statute might have on the election process.

Unfortunately for all of us, this question was never discussed in the committee. It was never debated; and I fear that grave constitutional questions may be involved. I believe that the right of one to contribute to a campaign in any State of the Union, provided the contribution is reported and is within legal limitations, is a basic right. However, I would not say that I could not be wrong on that point. That is one question that disturbs me very deeply.

I thank the Senator very much for his enlightening statements.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I know the extremely high motives behind the offering of this amendment. I know the character of the Senator from Vermont, and that he offers this amendment in good faith and with a desire to make our election process clean all the way. I have watched with admiration his attitude with reference to the other amendments which we have considered.

I am a little concerned that the amendment the Senator now proposes goes too far. I have a sister in Pennsylvania. If I were in a primary contest or in an election contest in New York, I understand that under the terms of this amendment if she sent me a check for $10 she would be violating a penal provision. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Does the Senator from Vermont feel that we should exclude all contributions from anyone outside the State or the congressional district where the candidate is running?

Mr. PROUTY. Generally speaking, yes. However, I would be willing to exempt members of one's family, if that is an important consideration.

Mr. KEATING. It might be that some of us might have a friend with $10, who might live in another State and be desirous of contributing to our campaign. Is it the feeling of the Senator from Vermont that there is something inherently wrong in a resident of one State contributing to a campaign in another State?

Mr. PROUTY. I think the definition of a friend could be extended ad infinitum. The expression is more or less meaningless. The Senator knows exactly what I am trying to prevent. Perhaps this amendment goes too far. Frankly, my chief purpose in offering the amendment was to get it on the record, primarily for future study and consideration. I believe we have a real problem when some interest—labor, business, or other interest or group—comes into a State and tries to dominate a primary election or a general election in that State. I think it is not their right, and I am very much opposed to it. Perhaps this amendment goes too far.

Mr. KEATING. I could not agree with the Senator from Vermont more completely about the abuse or possible abuse to which he is directing his amendment. Knowing the character and motives of the Senator from Vermont, it is just the type of thing I would expect from him.

Mr. PROUTY. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. KEATING. I am concerned about the fact that, as this amendment is worded, it goes too far. I think, with great reluctance, I would have to oppose the Senator's amendment because of that feature, even though I think perhaps we should try to frame some amendment which will effectuate—as the bill does not—the objectives which the Senator from Vermont is so commendably seeking to achieve.

Mr. PROUTY. I thank the Senator very much for expressing that sentiment, and I reiterate that that was my chief purpose in offering the amendment at this time—not in anticipation that it would be approved.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has expressed a fear which some of us have, that in some of the applications of this amendment it would make impossible contributions which in themselves would be perfectly innocent. For example, one Senator pointed out that he had a cousin in another State who might want to send him a little contribution in a primary campaign. It seems to me that that in itself would not be objectionable. I believe that the main objective of the Senator, to make it possible for a State to preserve its own voice and select its own candidates, is commendable.

There were some questions directed to the Senator which I thought really were questions with respect to the existing law. Is it not true that a large part of the Senator's amendment is merely reenactment of provisions of the existing law?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Many of the questions directed to the Senator earlier in the colloquy had to do actually with the application of present law, rather than with anything new which the Senator from Vermont was proposing.

Mr. PROUTY. That is absolutely true.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe that before the Senator concludes his remarks, it would be desirable if he were to summarize the particular changes which his amendment makes and to point out the parts of the amendment which are existing law.

Mr. PROUTY. I may say that the first subsection is almost all identical with existing law. It applies to intrastate contributions.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I recall that during the delivery of his very excellent explanation I addressed a few questions to him. He asked me to wait until the end of his prepared remarks. I am glad that he now has very kindly yielded to me, so that I may continue my interrogation very briefly.

I should like to say to the distinguished Senator, my good friend from Vermont, that I endorse 100 percent every kind word and everything that has been said about the motives behind his amendment. We who know him know that when he offers an amendment it is, first, an amendment designed for high purposes and, second, that it is carefully prepared and carefully presented.

However, I cannot refrain from pursuing this matter, particularly in view of the fact that I started my inquiry of the Senator earlier and had to desist. I wish to be perfectly clear in my mind that as an individual, back in the days when Robert Taft was running for the U.S. Senate, and when the eyes of the country were concentrated on the campaign in Ohio, if I had wanted to send

$5 to Taft's campaign, the Senator's amendment, if in the law, would have forced me to send my contribution to the Republican State Committee of the State of Ohio.

Mr. PROUTY. Or to a local committee in the State of Ohio if it is an adjunct of a national political party.

Mr. COTTON. Even though I have not the slightest interest who might be running for Governor or who might be running for Representative from a district, or who might be running for a county office, or for mayor of a city—and I might be a Democrat interested in a great Republican, because of his superb citizenship, or a Republican interested in a great Democrat—under the Senator's amendment I would still have to send my money to the Republican or Democratic committee in any other State. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. COTTON. However, if I happen to be a member of an organization which has a local chapter or a local group within the State of Ohio, for instance, all I would have to do to get my money to them and have them in turn relay it to Senator Taft's campaign committee. Is that correct? Is that what could happen if the Senator's amendment were adopted?

Mr. PROUTY. No.

Mr. COTTON. Why not?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator, I assume, is referring to a national group.

Mr. COTTON. What I am referring to—and let us be plain about it——

Mr. PROUTY. Assume a national group that does not have a headquarters in Ohio, for instance. If that is the question, under those circumstances the answer is "No."

Mr. COTTON. Does the Senator mean that Local No. 567, AFL–CIO, in Akron, Ohio, could not make a contribution to Senator Taft's campaign if by a stretch of the imagination we could conceive of their wanting to do so?

Mr. PROUTY. Certainly; it being an intrastate group.

Mr. COTTON. They are within the State.

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. Under the Senator's amendment no one would go in to find out where they got that money.

Mr. PROUTY. Well, that is perhaps a problem which ought to be met on another basis. However, a local organization, if it is a branch of a national organization, can contribute. On the other hand, the national organization could not send money into Ohio in this instance and give it to a local organization to distribute.

Mr. COTTON. In theory, no. But as a matter of fact, the adoption of the Senator's amendment—and I know what the purpose of the amendment is, and I am thoroughly in accord with its purpose, and I admire the Senator from Vermont greatly for his presentation of it—would mean—and his amendment could well be entitled "An amendment to stifle the American individual"—that John Q. Jones, as an individual, could not openly and frankly give money to help elect a Senator in another State.

Surely the Senator from Vermont is a very practical man and knows that any great national organization which is a composite of local organizations—and I am not trying to identify any particular group, because it could be a labor group, a group of farmers, or a group of manufacturers, or it could be individuals—could channel their contributions into the local chapter within a State and thus into the pockets of those who are waging a campaign for a Senator or other public official in that State. However, a bar would be raised which would make it impossible for an ordinary American individual, because he admires a great Senator in another State and admires his conduct on the floor of the Senate and his stand on certain principles, to write a check and send it to that individual's campaign committee.

If I wanted to help elect my distinguished friend, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], whom I admire so greatly, I would have to contribute to the Democratic State Committee of Missouri. I am not in favor of the Democratic State Committee in Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Missouri could not imagine anything better than the Senator's doing that.

Mr. COTTON. Is my assumption not correct?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct. I feel, perhaps because I am a States Righter that it is a prerogative which belongs to the people where the Senator is seeking nomination.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator believes that these elections are local elections. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. They are statewide elections. Much as I love and respect the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, I do not feel that I would have a right to contribute to his primary campaign.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator could not engage in a more worthy activity than to contribute to the campaign of the Senator from New Hampshire. It seems to me to be a tragedy that such a serious bar should preclude his doing so. If it is purely a local election, why should we try to regulate it from Washington? If it is a Federal election, what consistency or constitutionality is there in trying to raise these State lines and trying to set up a barrier, so that simply because I live across the Connecticut River a few miles away from my dear friend from Vermont, whom I admire, I cannot send him a $5 contribution, or, more than that, anything of value?

I know what the Senator is going to say in explanation. I made a speech at the Republican State convention in Vermont during the last campaign, and as a result the Republicans nearly lost Vermont for the first time in history.

Mr. PROUTY. Perhaps if the Senator had not been there we would have lost.

Mr. COTTON. If the speech happened to be of any value, and if it helped—I do not expect the Senator to agree that it was of any help, and I do not know whether it was of any value—I do not know whether I could go into another State to make a speech.

Mr. PROUTY. I am sure we all recognize that that is a little far fetched. The amendment relates solely to financial contributions.

Mr. COTTON. I am not so sure. If I paid my own expenses, which I did, because no Vermonter ever pays a visitor's expenses—or if the Republican National Committee paid my expenses, or if the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee paid my expenses, I am not sure that it would not be a thing of value, even though it were a poor speech. What I have said is not entirely facetious either, even though the last part may be.

Mr. PROUTY. "Anything of value" is included in many statutes, and it has always been held to be something concrete.

Mr. COTTON. I have just one more question. We all know what the Senator is getting at, and we all know that this deals with a matter of handing money under the table, and sending it into States to affect elections. However, is that not a matter of reporting? Most States have on their statute books corrupt practices acts which take care of such situations.

The unfortunate example, which the Senator cited when he began his speech, of the man who was going around the country attempting to hand Senators $2,500 for their campaigns, was an example of a person who was already probably in violation of the Corrupt Practices Act and of the laws of two-thirds of the States in the Union.

But rather than to raise a barrier between States, so that an American citizen cannot even help someone across a State line, would it not be the proper approach—and I am sure Senators would support this view very fully—to be certain that there must be reporting? Should not the Federal act about which we are speaking—the so-called clean elections law, which has been bruited about so much—be a reporting act?

Mr. PROUTY. I think I may suggest to the Senator that reporting requirements have been in the law for years, and there have been very few convictions, as I recall, for improper activities.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I also address these remarks to the distinguished junior from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. I think one of our difficulties is that we forget that a citizen who can well afford to contribute substantial sums of money will be interested in the cause rather than in the candidate. McKinley said, in 1896, before the students in Michigan, that it is not the party which makes the issue; it is the issue which makes the party. A person becomes interested in an issue. Then he sees in the press the names of persons who are candidates for Federal office, who become symbols or examplars of the issue and the cause. That is the thing for which a contribution is made.

Shall we draw arbitrary lines and say that because a person lives in Ohio, he cannot contribute in Indiana, when actually he might have a brother running in

Indiana, or a candidate is someone who is very much to his liking, and one who supports with vigor the cause of the free system of this country? I think the proposal is extremely arbitrary. We do not make this sort of provision to apply to any other situation.

I think the whole idea of cleanliness, as the Senator from Nebraska has said, is being carried to a point where it is actually damaging and does not go to the heart of the reason for which contributions are made.

Mr. COTTON. That was the point I was bringing up. I think the Senator from Vermont was very courteous in his response.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. First, if the Senator will indulge me before I ask him a question at the first part of my interruption—and I hope he will not be taken off the floor because of my comment—I should like to say to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] that I am certain that whatever the outcome of the election was when he went to the neighboring State and made a speech, the adverse result in the election was not due to his speech. I assure him that we will take a chance on his coming to South Dakota at any time he feels able and free to come out there, and will be confident in our own minds that any contribution he might make in the way of a speech will be helpful to the cause.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I may say that the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] was most kind to me on that visit. What I said about Vermonters paying our expenses over there was facetious, because I had to drive only a few miles across the line. I had a delightful time. The Senator from Vermont has never once reproached me for the apparent results of my visit.

I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his expression of confidence.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. With respect to the amendment and one of the points which has arisen, it is my personal opinion that the Senator from Vermont has performed a most useful service in directing attention to the matter of interstate contributions.

There are certainly at least two classes of contributions: One class would be the contributions described by the Senator from Illinois as coming from someone who has a perfectly good motivation in wanting to support someone who has identified himself with a great cause, and wants to see him nominated and elected.

But there is, of course, the other type of contribution, the kind which is made, or is sought to be made, for the purpose of affecting the result in an election, only as a means to an end of affecting selfishly legislation which might be developed in Congress. The latter type certainly would be condemned by every Member of the Senate.

I am of the opinion that something of the objective which the Senator has sought to accomplish will be accomplished by a provision now written into the bill, making the bill applicable to the primary contests and nominating conventions, as well as to general elections.

Mr. PROUTY. I may say to the Senator from South Dakota that that is very true.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. One thing which the bill does is to make those things which come within its purview subject to reporting. It also requires that the reports be made available, so far as possible, in advance of the election. That is the 10-day provision. It seems to me that the class of contributions which are objectionable, and which would be covered by the Senator's amendment, will to a certain extent be caught by the reporting of contributions, now that such reporting is applicable to the primaries.

As the Senator has said, that contribution could be made in a general election, and be made through the device of giving it to a committee affiliated with the national organization, and earmarked, so to speak, for the particular candidate or candidacy which the contributor wishes to espouse. There, of course, it would be subject to reporting under the provisions of the bill.

But also now, under the provisions of the bill, if it should become law, with the amendment relating to the primaries, the sinister type of contribution would also be subject to reporting in primaries and conventions. To that extent, the objective which the Senator from Vermont seeks will, I think, be accomplished by the amendments already adopted in the bill.

Mr. PROUTY. I think real progress has been made in this direction yesterday and today as a result of the amendments which were added to the bill as it was reported. I think the bill is a reasonably strong one at present. It represents a step forward in our desire for really clean elections.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Contributions to a campaign per se are not objectionable. Everybody recognizes that if a person runs for public office—particularly for Federal office—some funds are required to do so. If we are not to put a bar against a person of limited means running, it must be possible for him to receive contributions. But if the public knows the source and the amount of the contributions, then the public is in a position to judge as to the validity of the motives behind the contributions, and can vote accordingly. That will help in their appraisal of the candidacy.

So I feel that the reporting features of the bill, as they apply to both the primaries or the nominating conventions and the general elections will be very salutary when the bill is enacted. I certainly hope it will be passed by the Senate and approved by the other body and by the President.

Mr. PROUTY. I fully agree with the comments made by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, my purpose having been achieved, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Vermont is withdrawn.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, before the Senator from Vermont yields the floor, will he yield to me?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I feel that our colleague, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, has performed a very useful service in focusing our attention on the abuses which he had in mind in drafting the amendment. I admire and agree with his attitude in withdrawing the amendment, but I think he is entitled to widespread commendation from us for the fine presentation he has made and for the very important and salutary points which he has brought out concerning some of the abuses.

Mr. PROUTY. I sincerely appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New York.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I express my appreciation and commendation to the Senator from Vermont for the spirit he has shown in uniting some of us in our common purpose to get a bill. I have the greatest respect for the Senator's philosophy on this subject. I think that at this stage of the proceedings the Senator from Vermont has shown that he can rise to reality, in terms of making possible the enactment of a bill on this subject, and that he can join us in working toward that goal.

I assure him that it will be my wish and my hope to collaborate with him in the future in undertaking to work out a provision similar to his amendment, or at least containing some of the provisions of his amendment, so we may have the benefit of his thought, advice, counsel, industry, and activity.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I appreciate very much those remarks of the Senator from Missouri. I particularly appreciate also his untiring work on the measure to deal with this problem. Certainly he deserves the thanks of all Members of the Senate and of the people of the country as a whole.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is identified as "1–19–60—D." I offer the amendment on behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, between lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

AMENDMENT OF THE HATCH ACT

SEC. 305. After the effective date of this Act, such Act of August 2, 1939, as amended, shall not be construed to prevent Federal employees whose legal residence is outside the District of Columbia from taking an active part in political management or in political campaigns in the case of State and local offices.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to allow Federal employees to hold State and local offices and to participate in political activities connected with the election to such offices.

We have before us Senate bill 2436, the purpose of which is to revise the Federal election laws and to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections. This invites us to take another look at the Hatch Act, and to correct some of its now archaic provisions.

The Hatch Act was enacted in 1939—more than 20 years ago. It answered a definite need of the time. However, like some other laws passed in the 1930's, the Hatch Act has become outdated, and in some respects it has become harmful, rather than beneficial.

Twenty years ago, it was impossible to know that millions of people would leave the cities, and would migrate to the suburbs. It was also impossible to know that from this migration would arise hundreds of communities, many of which would achieve the status of municipalities in their own right.

Since it is the nature of the American people to seek self-government, there grew in these communities local civic committees or councils, by means of which the suburban residents sought to exercise self-government. Before long, these communities grew to the point where more formal governments were necessary.

Up to that point, a resident of one of these communities could, without regard to the Hatch Act, serve in the capacity of a local governing official, even though he was a Federal Government employee. However, once the formalities of modern local governments were imposed, the Hatch Act limitations applied. Federal Government employees thus were precluded from taking active parts in the fundamental practice of self-government.

When I propose that Federal Government employees be permitted to hold State or local offices, I have in mind offices which by their nature would not affect the ability of such a person to perform his full-time duties for the Federal Government. It goes without saying that no person can hold two full-time jobs at the same time. Certainly, no Federal Government employee could continue to hold his Federal position while he was serving in a major State or local capacity which would demand the major portion of his time.

The amendment I propose is not intended to scuttle the Hatch Act. Rather, the purpose of the amendment is to bring up to date that which has become outdated. Its purpose is to recognize and reestablish the right of an individual to use his free time to participate with his fellow citizens in the basic functions of government.

The Federal Government employs 2,364,000 civilians. Among them, there are many whose community consciousness and civic abilities and interests in their neighbors and their communities should not be discouraged.

Through the Hatch Act, as it now stands, we have been disfranchising this group completely. Not only is that unfair; it is also contrary to the best interests of good government.

Do we have such an abundance of qualified local officials that we can deny this field of interest to more than 2 million people? I think not, Mr. President.

As a matter of fact, we should do everything possible to encourage the Federal Government employees to accept the responsibilities of citizens of the local level.

It is in this spirit that I propose this amendment to the Hatch Act.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. BEALL. Certainly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the Senator's amendment is excellent, but I should like to ask several questions about its meaning.

Would the Senator's amendment make it possible for school board members to take active parts in such political management or campaigns?

Mr. BEALL. Yes; because usually the school boards meet in the evenings, not during the day.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. How about State auditors in small towns?

Mr. BEALL. A State auditor usually has a full-time job. I am thinking more of those who serve as city councilmen or in similar positions in small towns—members of groups which meet in the evenings, which meetings do not interfere with the regular daytime duties of those persons.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the amendment, would a town treasurer also be permitted to take such an active part?

Mr. BEALL. Yes; because generally his job as town treasurer is a part-time one.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But the Senator's amendment is not intended, is it, to open the door to active participation by Federal employees in additional full-time jobs?

Mr. BEALL. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let me inquire about the members of State legislatures.

Mr. BEALL. Generally, they obtain leave of absence to attend the sessions of the legislatures; and most of the State legislatures have sessions which last for only 30, 60, or 90 days.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have in mind a bill which would enable residents of the District of Columbia to vote in connection with the selection of delegates to the national conventions. The first bill on that subject which we passed was vetoed, because of some fear that it would interfere with the operation of the Hatch Act. I would not want such action to occur in connection with this bill.

Mr. BEALL. Does the Senator from South Dakota mean to say that Federal Government employees should not have a right to be elected to serve in State conventions?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. All I know is that the President vetoed the first bill we passed, when we endeavored to provide such an opportunity for the residents of the District of Columbia; and the veto was based on a fear by the President that the bill would interfere with the operation of the Hatch Act.

I would like the pending amendment much better if the Senator from Maryland would strike from it the word "State," in line 7. I think such a modification of the amendment would improve it.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I accept the suggestion; and I modify my amendment accordingly. The modification will thus limit the application of the amendment to counties or municipalities.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; and also to school boards.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask a similar question. Do I correctly understand that the able author of the amendment has agreed to eliminate from it the word "State," in line 7?

Mr. BEALL. Yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In that event, the amendment merely means that Federal employees can participate in campaigns such as those for election to a county court?

Mr. BEALL. To a county council or to be county commissioners.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is what I meant by using the phrase "county court."

Mr. BEALL. Yes, provided—as I have stated plainly in the course of my remarks—such activity did not interfere with the performance of their regular duties in their regular Federal Government jobs. Of course, most of the county organizations—for instance, the county councils—meet in the evenings.

Mr. NEUBERGER. My question is quite similar to the one the Senator from South Dakota asked: Would not the inclusion of the word "State" legitimatize participation by Federal Government employees in campaigns for the election of State Governors, for example? If so, the amendment would break down the effectiveness of the Hatch Act.

Mr. BEALL. At this point let me say to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] that a moment ago I agreed to eliminate from our amendment the word "State."

Mr. COTTON and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. The amendment, as amended, will be restricted to local officers. What is the effect of it in a State in which delegates are elected to a convention to nominate candidates for Governor or U.S. Senator? Can Federal Civil Service employees in such a State be candidates for delegates and serve in a convention and cast their ballots to nominate a Senator of the United States or a Member of the House or some other State officer?

Mr. BEALL. I would not think so, under our understanding.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. As the Senator knows, he was courteous and kind enough to mention this matter to me yesterday and again today. Without

in any way wishing to discountenance or disparage the Senator's purposes, it would seem to me, Mr. President, may I say to the junior Senator from Maryland, I cannot see that this proposal is germane or has any place whatsoever in a so-called elections bill. I think it properly would come within the jurisdiction of the committee of which the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is chairman, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which, of course, does have jurisdiction of and which has engaged in a study of the so-called Hatch Act in relation to Federal employees or employees of States, or those whose salaries are derived from Federal contributions, as I recall the two provisions of the Hatch Act.

I think it would be unfortunate if we were to encumber a Federal elections bill with this provision to amend the Hatch Act. I do not know why citizens who live in other States cannot engage in political activities, unless they come within the Hatch Act. It seems to me what we had better set about doing is amend the entire Hatch Act, and not try to take an oblique approach by making this proposal a part of an elections bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. BEALL. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I am inclined to share the views of the Senator from Missouri about this not being the proper time or place to deal with this problem. However, I can well understand the motives actuating my distinguished friend from Maryland in offering this proposal, because I am aware of the great interest which he takes in the many Federal employees who reside in the State of Maryland and who might be desirous of participating, and probably are desirous of participating, in only local elections in towns and cities in the State.

Maryland and Virginia have rather peculiar problems that some of the rest of the States do not have, and I commend the Senator from Maryland for bringing this subject before us, because it shows his interest in the many, many thousands of Federal employees who live in his great State.

I desire to address a question to the Senator from Maryland with regard to the merits of the amendment, if it seems prudent to pass on it now. With the word "State" eliminated, the amendment is limited to participation with regard to local offices only. Let us assume a case where the Senator from Maryland was running on the same ticket with a local official in the State of Maryland. Would it not be pretty difficult to separate the activities of a Federal employee in advancing the cause of Mr. X, the local candidate, and the cause of Senator BEALL?

Mr. BEALL. I do not think so. As a matter of fact, he might be interested in it, but he would not himself be a candidate. In most cases in Maryland candidates for judgeship do not actively participate. They go out, but do not make campaign speeches. That practice is characteristic in our State.

Mr. KEATING. I have not framed this idea in any precise language, but I wonder if the Senator from Maryland would be willing to accept a further amendment which would seem to me to pin it down more to a particular contest for a local office, some proviso to the effect that it would apply only where the local office or offices were the only offices under contest in that particular election.

Mr. BEALL. In the territory the Senator is talking about, namely, the State of Maryland, we do not elect municipal officers on the same ballot with State and Federal officers. That is a separate ballot.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, it never happens in Maryland?

Mr. BEALL. In the case of the county council it happens.

Mr. KEATING. What I was getting at is this. I know what the Senator is seeking to achieve, and I am quite sympathetic to letting a man who works in the Interior Department, for example, who wants to run for a school board in Maryland, or who wants to serve on the school board, to do so. It is a commendable objective. I personally think he should be entitled to do that; but I would not want him to be able to participate in a campaign in which a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives was running at the same time as the local official in whom he was interested was running. I would not want him to be on the ballot at the same time. If some language could be worked out to effectuate that objective, I wonder if it would meet with the approval of the Senator from Maryland. I suppose he would rather see it in writing.

Mr. BEALL. I would rather first see it in writing. I want to thank the Senator from New York for his suggestion, but first I would like to ask the Presiding Officer or Parliamentarian to rule on the question proposed by the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. HENNINGS], as to whether this amendment is germane or not.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the distinguished Senator from Maryland directed a question to me?

Mr. BEALL. I directed a question to the Chair. The Senator from Missouri said that, in his opinion, he did not think this amendment was germane.

Mr. HENNINGS. I would not want to undertake to make such a parliamentary ruling, I may say to my friend. It was not a subcommittee that reported the bill. It is the full Committee on Rules and Administration which undertook to report an elections bill. We have offered certain amendments to a bill which might be called a contributions and reporting bill.

I think, if my good friend would oblige, if the proposal could have some further consideration by an appropriate committee, this amendment never having been suggested heretofore, until the Senator was courteous enough to suggest the matter to me yesterday, we could then go into the matter of the Hatch Act and its application in regular order and to greater effect.

As I read the Senator's amendment—I appreciate the purposes of it and the Senator's interest in it—we are discussing only the District of Columbia. The Hatch Act applies nationwide, in all States of the Union. In my opinion, not as a parliamentary matter but as a matter of relevance, this proposal has no place in a bill relating to the machinery of elections.

Mr. BEALL. We just use the words "District of Columbia." Of course I mean any place in the country. The words "District of Columbia" are used, but the amendment refers to anybody domiciled or living outside the District of Columbia.

Unfortunately the citizens in the District of Columbia do not have the right of the franchise, which I think a great many of us favor giving to them.

Mr. HENNINGS. A great many of us are in favor of that.

I wish the Senator had given us an opportunity to discuss the matter with him before presenting it to the Senate without any committee consideration whatsoever, in the midst of consideration of certain requirements for spending and reporting, and limitations on amounts.

Mr. BEALL. Perhaps the Senator from Missouri remembers that this same provision passed the House of Representatives some 10 or 12 years ago. The then Representative Sasscer and myself sponsored it, and it passed the House but died in this body.

Mr. HENNINGS. It was not at that time a part of any election bill?

Mr. BEALL. No.

Mr. RANDOLPH and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the diligent Senator from Maryland is to be congratulated for seizing upon any opportunity to bring this matter to the attention of his colleagues. Certainly the prohibition against the people living within the District of Columbia, or those who work in the District of Columbia and live in nearby Maryland and Virginia, from participating in local elections is something which deserves the attention of this body.

In the State of West Virginia, in the counties of Morgan, Berkeley, and Jefferson, there are people who commute from those eastern panhandle areas and hold Federal positions in the District of Columbia. Those citizens also have the desire, as expressed by the Senator from Maryland, to be active in local elections, as well as the States mentioned specifically by the sponsors of the proposed legislation, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who is the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, also cosponsors this proposal.

I shall not labor this point, because I know the purpose which motivates my colleague of other days in the House, where we considered this matter, to again bring it to the attention of the Congress. I applaud him for seizing up-

on this opportunity. It may not be the most appropriate time to bring it to the attention of Senators for inclusion in the pending bill, but the principle is a good one.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator from West Virginia, who is an old friend of mine. I know the Senator has had a very active interest in this matter for many, many years, at least for the 17 years in which I have been in Congress. The Senator has always been very active, both as a former Member and as a former chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, in looking after the interests of and the welfare of this community.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEATING and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Is it necessary for the Chair to rule on the germaneness of the amendment in order for us to consider it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, it is not. This is not an appropriation bill, and the Senate is not operating under a unanimous-consent agreement. Therefore, the question of germaneness does not arise.

Mr. KEATING. So we are free to consider the amendment on its merits?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEATING. I ask the Senator from Maryland to give consideration to this: In the amendment as it now reads, at the very end it states, "In the case of local offices." That is the way it now reads, since the words "State and" have been stricken.

I wonder if the Senator would favorably consider, in place of that language, using the words "solely involving municipal and county offices."

Mr. BEALL. That would be all right. We will accept that amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that. I think it clarifies the language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his amendment?

Mr. BEALL. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am not insensible to some of the problems which confront the distinguished Senator from Maryland and other Senators who are interested in the local communities near the District of Columbia. I sincerely hope that no action will be taken as to this particular amendment at this time, for the reason that the Civil Service Commission at the present time can exempt areas and can exempt certain employees from operations in this regard. The Civil Service Commission has already done so, in regard to the Hatch Act, in respect to local elections in municipalities and for such offices as membership on the school boards.

In order that there be no question as to what has been done and what can be done I should like to read from pamphlet No. 20, November 1959, U.S. Civil Service Commission, entitled "Political Activity of Federal Officers and Employees," on page 16, under the heading "Exceptions to Hatch Act Restrictions."

The Hatch Act specified two conditions under which political activity on the part of Federal officers and employees is permissible.

(1) Section 18 of the act sets forth an exception relating to elections not specifically identified with National or State issues or political parties.

(2) Section 16 of the act sets forth an exception relating to political campaigns in communities adjacent to the District of Columbia or in communities the majority of whose voters are employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this section of the pamphlet and the listing of the particular areas and the reports and orders of the Commission be printed as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

V. EXCEPTIONS TO HATCH ACT RESTRICTIONS

The Hatch Act specified two conditions under which political activity on the part of Federal officers and employees is permissible.

(1) Section 18 of the act sets forth an exception relating to elections not specifically identified with National or State issues or political parties.

(2) Section 16 of the act sets forth an exception relating to political campaigns in communities adjacent to the District of Columbia, or in communities the majority of whose voters are employees of the Federal Government.

Both sections are quoted on page 4 of this pamphlet.

SECTION 18

To be permissible under section 18, the activity must be of a strictly local character—completely unrelated to issues and candidates that are identified with National and State political parties.

SECTION 16

For many years prior to enactment of the Hatch Act, Federal employees residing in certain municipalities near the District of Columbia were permitted to be candidates for, and to hold, local office in those municipalities.

The permission was granted either by an individual Executive order or by action of the Commission based on an Executive order, and it remained in full force and effect until the passage of the act of August 2, 1939, which prohibited active participation in political management or in political campaigns, without exception. When this act was amended by the act of July 19, 1940, a new section was added (sec. 16, 54 Stat. 767) whereby the Commission was authorized to promulgate regulations extending the privilege of active participation in local political management and local political campaigns to Federal employees residing in any municipalities or other political subdivisions of the States of Maryland and Virginia in the immediate vicinity of the District of Columbia or in municipalities the majority of whose voters are employed by the Government of the United States.

The Commission has promulgated regulations governing the extension of the privileges set forth in the section quoted above and copies of these regulations are available upon request to the Commission's central office in Washington, D.C. Under these regulations it is necessary that a formal request be received from the representatives of the community involved and that the petitioners furnish certain specified information relative to their community and its elections. In all cases the final decision as to the extension of the privileges of section 16 of any individual municipality depends on the municipality's meeting certain prerequisites that are set forth in the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has extended the privileges allowed by section 16 of the Hatch Act to the following municipalities or political subdivisions by formal action recorded on the dates indicated:

In Maryland: Annapolis, May 16, 1941; Berwyn Heights, June 15, 1944; Bethesda, February 17, 1948; Bladensburg, April 20, 1942; Bowie, April 11, 1952; Brentwood, September 26, 1940; Capitol Heights, November 12, 1940; Cheverly, December 18, 1940; Chevy Chase, sections 1 and 2, March 4, 1941; Chevy Chase, section 3, October 8, 1940; Chevy Chase, section 4, October 2, 1940; Martin's Additions 1, 2, 3, and 4, to Chevy Chase, February 13, 1941; Chevy Chase View, February 26, 1941; College Park, June 13, 1945; Cottage City, January 15, 1941; District Heights, November 2, 1940; Edmonston, October 24, 1940; Fairmont Heights, October 24, 1940; Forest Heights, April 22, 1949; Garrett Park, October 2, 1940; Glenarden, May 21, 1941; Glen Echo, October 22, 1940; Greenbelt, October 4, 1940; Hyattsville, September 20, 1940; Kensington, November 8, 1940; Landover Hills, May 5, 1945; Morningside, May 19, 1949; Mount Rainier, November 22, 1940; North Beach, September 20, 1940; North Brentwood, May 6, 1941; North Chevy Chase, July 22, 1942; Northwest Park, February 17, 1943; Riverdale, September 26, 1940; Rockville, April 15, 1948; Seat Pleasant, August 31, 1942; Somerset, November 23, 1940; Takoma Park, October 22, 1940; University Park, January 18, 1941; Washington Grove, April 5, 1941.

In Virginia: Alexandria, April 15, 1941; Arlington County, September 9, 1940; Clifton, July 14, 1941; Fairfax County, November 10, 1949; town of Fairfax, February 9, 1954; Falls Church, June 6, 1941; Herndon, April 7, 1945; Vienna, March 18, 1946; Portsmouth, February 27, 1958.

Other municipalities: Bremerton, Wash., February 27, 1946; Port Orchard, Wash., February 27, 1946; Elmer City, Wash., October 28, 1947; Anchorage, Alaska, December 29, 1947; Benicia, Calif., February 20, 1948; Warner Robins, Ga., March 19, 1948; Sierra Vista, Ariz., October 5, 1955; New Johnsonville, Tenn., April 26, 1956; Huachuca City, Ariz., April 9, 1959.

The Commission's actions extending the privileges of active participation in local self-government of the above-listed communities to resident Federal officers and employees are subject to the following restrictions:

(1) Federal officers and employees in the exercise of these privileges must not neglect their official duties and must not engage in nonlocal partisan political activities.

(2) Federal officers and employees must not run for local office as candidates representing a political party or become involved in political management in connection with the campaign of a party candidate for office.

(3) Federal officers and employees who are candidates for local elective office must run as independent candidates.

(4) Federal officers and employees elected or appointed to local offices requiring full-time service must resign their positions with the Federal Government. If elected or appointed to offices requiring only part-time service they may accept and hold the same without relinquishing their Federal employment provided the holding of such part-time office does not conflict or interfere with their duties as officers or employees of the

Federal Government. The department or independent agency in which Federal officers or employees are employed is the sole judge of whether or not the holding of the local office conflicts or interferes with their official duties as officers or employees of the Federal Government.

(5) The permission granted by the Commission to any particular community may be suspended or withdrawn by the Commission when in its opinion the activities resulting therefrom are or may become detrimental to the public interest or inimical to the proper enforcement of the political-activity law and rules.

Mr. CARLSON. As I stated, Mr. President, I am not insensible to the problem. I sincerely hope that any action taken in this regard will consider the fact that the Civil Service Commission has great authority at the present time. I am sure the Commission will exercise the authority when it is felt it would be in the best interest of the Federal employees.

I urge that no action be taken which might in any way jeopardize our Federal employees. These Federal workers are, after all, an operating agency of our Federal Government when it comes to political activity. We should make sure that no pressure can be placed upon them to require them to get into political campaigns. I think that would be most unfortunate at this time.

I therefore urge the distinguished Senator from our adjoining State of Maryland to withdraw his amendment. I assure him I shall cooperate with him in trying to get additional relief in this field.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator knows of the high regard I have for him in all matters, and particularly with respect to his interest in the District of Columbia.

Do I correctly understand that the amendment would permit every clerk in the post office in Philadelphia to get into Philadelphia municipal politics?

Mr. BEALL. That would not necessarily be true in the big metropolitan centers, where these officers have pretty high salaries. The office of city councilman may be a salaried and full-time position. The amendment would not cover that. The amendment only provides that the person may participate in local politics when it does not interfere with his official duties as an employee of the Federal Government.

Mr. CLARK. What concerns me, I will say frankly to the Senator, is that this would turn the Federal patronage wide open, to get these employees into municipal political affairs, and thus overturn a reform which took us years and years to accomplish. That concerns me very much.

I should be inclined to support an amendment which I think is what my friend has in mind, which would permit a man who works for the Federal Government in the District of Columbia and has a home in Arlington, Va., or in Maryland, and who wants to run for the office of member of a school board, to do so. If he wants to participate in that type of politics outside the District of Columbia, such participation would be all right, but I would not like to see a swarm of Federal employees, who are now properly forbidden by the Hatch Act to stay out of local politics, getting into deciding who was going to be the councilman or the mayor, in Philadelphia, or who was going to occupy any one of those offices. Thank goodness we got the Federal employees out of that years ago.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I do not believe the Senator from Pennsylvania was in the Chamber when the modification was made in the last two lines of the amendment. The amendment, as modified, now provides for insertion on page 19, between lines 7 and 8, of the following new section:

AMENDMENT OF THE HATCH ACT

SEC. 305. After the effective date of this Act, the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities" approved August 2, 1939, as amended, shall not be construed to prevent Federal employees whose legal residence is outside the District of Columbia from taking an active part in political management or in political campaigns solely involving county, municipal, or other local offices.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I note the presence in the Chamber of both the Senators from New York. I wonder if they would not agree with me that an amendment which would permit all the Federal employees in New York City to enter into the question of who was to be mayor or president of the Borough of Manhattan would be an unfortunate step backward, at a time when we have insulated workers under civil service from participation in local municipal affairs. I may be wrong about this, but I have lived with this problem for a long time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am not entirely sure, for example, that the postal workers should not have the privilege of serving on a school board in some town. I have always been quite of the opinion that the Hatch Act might be too rigid with regard to the possibility of Federal employees engaging in certain local political activities. For example, I know that many postal workers are having a hard time making ends meet, under present rates.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. Some of them are taking second jobs. If one of them were qualified to serve on a school board, or to serve in some other local office, I am inclined to think that there is not much wrong with letting him do so.

Let me say to my friend from Maryland that I rather think this is a question which should have further study by the committee charged with responsibility in this area, namely, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I do not believe we should try to arrive at a solution of the problem here, because even though I have made a suggestion for what I feel would be an improvement in the amendment, I am not certain yet in my own mind just where I should land when it comes to the question of a vote.

I think there is merit in what my friend from Pennsylvania has said, but I think we should give some thought to the question of allowing Federal employees to have a little more participation than they have now in local activities. There is nothing wrong about politics. Politics is good, when it is conducted right. Federal employees are greatly restricted in anything they do, and many of them are afraid to say, "I like JOE CLARK," or "I like KEN KEATING," because someone may say, "You are engaging in political activities." I am sympathetic toward what the Senator from Maryland has said, but I think it would be helpful if he would withdraw his amendment so that we may confine our activities here to the piece of legislation which is before us.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, Senators will note that I am listed as one of the cosponsors of this amendment. When it was brought to me by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and they talked with me concerning the situation which we face in the District, Virginia, and Maryland, I sympathized with them very much. So far as I was concerned, being chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I did not oppose the amendment, and I told them I would go along with it.

I believe that something should be done for the people of the District of Columbia. As Senators know, I have always opposed home rule in the District, but I think the people should have a right to vote if they live in Virginia or Maryland, and they should have the right to participate to a certain extent in local political activities. I believe we shall have to go very carefully into the situation when we consider amending the Hatch Act.

I also believe Federal employees ought to be given more latitude in exercising the rights of citizens of the United States in electing candidates to the Senate and the House, and to other poliical offices.

I believe the Senator from Maryland has agreed to withdraw his amendment, under the circumstances in which we find ourselves.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I had expressed to the distinguished Senator from Maryland the hope that he would withdraw his amendment, with the understanding, of course, in view of the evident interest, that he might offer it again tomorrow in order to afford Senators an opportunity to puzzle over the question overnight. Other considerations may arise. If that could be done, I certainly would concur that action on the part of my distinguished friend from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I will accept the suggestion offered by the minority leader and withdraw my amendment for the time being, with the understanding that I may have the right to offer it tomorrow, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The Senator has that right.

The Senator from Maryland has withdrawn his amendment.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for his consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to the assistant majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the information of Senators, I wonder if it would be possible to conclude very shortly today's discussion on the pending legislation, in order that the Senate may go into executive session to consider nominations, and permit several Senators who have indicated a desire to speak, to do so, during the remainder of the day.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, in reply to my friend, the assistant majority leader, let me say that, as a part of the pending bill, there are several amendments which do nothing more than bring the present Corrupt Practices Act up to date by increasing from $50 to $100 the direct-contribution reporting provision which appears in the existing law. I now ask that that increase be made, and I offer the amendments which I send to the desk. I have nothing further to say about them, except that they also bring the bill into harmony with existing law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish the amendments to be read?

Mr. HENNINGS. No. I ask that they be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents after "Sec. 202. Reports by political committees." insert the following:

"Sec. 203. Reports by others than political committees."

Page 2, in the table of contents, beginning with "Sec. 203" renumber the sections through "Sec. 212" to conform to above amendments.

Page 8, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"REPORTS BY OTHERS THAN POLITICAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 203. Every person (other than those filing reports pursuant to section 202) who makes an expenditure in one or more items aggregating $100 or more within a calendar year, other than by contribution to a political committee, for the purpose of influencing, in two or more States, election of candidates, shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on a form to be prescribed by him, an itemized detailed report of such expenditures in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 202, and shall file a copy thereof (subject to the provisions of section 207(b)) with the clerk of the United States district court for the district in which such expenditures are made, and in the case of any expenditure in support of a candidate for President, Vice President, or United States Senator, shall file a copy of the report with the Secretary of the Senate."

Page 5, line 20, strike out "206" and insert in lieu thereof "207".

Page 8, line 8, strike out "SEC. 203" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 204".

Page 8, line 13, strike out "206" and insert in lieu thereof "207".

Page 9, line 13, strike out "207" and insert in lieu thereof "208".

Page 10, lines 13 and 14, strike out "candidate or by a treasurer of a political committee" and insert in lieu thereof "candidate, a treasurer of a political committee, or by any other person,".

Page 10, line 17, strike out "206" and insert in lieu thereof "207".

Page 11, line 8, strike out "SEC. 205" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 206".

Page 11, line 22, strike out "SEC. 206" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 207".

Page 12, line 20, strike out "SEC. 207" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 208".

Page 14, line 9, strike out "SEC. 208" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 209".

Page 14, line 16, strike out "SEC. 209" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 210".

Page 14, line 20, strike out "SEC. 210" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 211".

Page 14, line 25, strike out "207" and insert in lieu thereof "208".

Page 15, line 4, strike out "SEC. 211" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 212".

Page 15, line 10, strike out "SEC. 212" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 213".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield the floor?

Mr. HENNINGS. No. I ask for the question.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the amendments which I have offered are very simple. The present Corrupt Practices Act provides that a $50 direct expenditure made by any person must be reported. We propose to increase the cutoff from $50 to $100, in order to bring the provision more nearly in line with present campaign costs.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As I understand, this provision is in the law today.

Mr. HENNINGS. This is in the present law, under which we are theoretically functioning. We propose to increase the amount, and to liberalize the provision so as to bring it into line with modern conditions. We propose to increase the amount from $50 to $100. I do not know why that should cause any debate or discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc. The amendments are identified as "1-18-60—A."

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the amendments be printed in the RECORD at this point. It is an explanation of the amendments.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

Under the existing law, reports must be filed by (1) political committees, (2) candidates for Senator and Representative, and (3) persons other than political committees making expenditures "other than by contribution to a political committee" of $50 or more within a calendar year in order to influence elections of candidates in two or more States.

As we have been discussing the past few days, one of the foundations of the existing law is the principle of disclosure. Reporting is the means chosen to achieve this goal. At the present date, nobody doubts the importance of reports by candidates for congressional office and political committees in order to safeguard the integrity of Federal elections. But equally important is to require reporting from those who do not contribute to political committees but prefer to make expenditures directly in order to promote the cause of candidates of their choice.

This requirement of the existing law by the definition of the term "person" includes any organization or group of persons, as well as individuals. But the duty to report arises only if such persons try to influence Federal elections in two or more States. This provision is not limited to individuals, because the purpose of this legislation is full disclosure and, therefore, it is necessary to require maximum reporting of all direct expenditures. The requirement that persons who are not political committees shall report does not by implication widen the scope of the term "political committee." No State or local committees are involved. At the same time, the existing law considers it of importance to have this category of persons report their activities. Vast amounts of money may be spent by individuals and organizations which do not qualify as political committees to promote the chances of certain candidates. An army of canvassers may be hired to carry out door-to-door campaigns. Radio and television time may be bought, or other types of expenditures made. If this group of persons is not required to report, it would be difficult, probably impossible, to have an idea of the amount of such expenditures.

In this connection, it is my opinion that such activities would not be subject to the limitation of contributions to $5,000 for each candidate as it appears in section 608(a) of title 18 of the United States Code. This is a criminal statute and according to the well-known rule of law must be strictly interpreted. Under this statute, only excessive contributions are punishable whereas in our case, only expenditures are involved. It is for this reason, I believe the existing law has imposed the duty of reporting on persons making direct expenditures. Legally speaking, with respect to reporting, this category of persons is placed in the position of political committees.

The new elections bill while retaining reporting by political committees and candidates, does not require persons making direct expenditures to report. This omission in the new elections bill represents a weakening of disclosure requirements, as compared to those of the existing law. It withdraws from the public eye a wide field of campaign financing. As I have said, we all know that money is spent by individuals and groups of persons in order to promote the cause of candidates directly and not by contributing to political committees. Without the light of publicity upon them, people favoring certain candidates may be tempted to prefer anonymity and to substitute direct expenditures for contributions to political committees.

I believe it is important to retain the provisions of the existing law, requiring persons making direct expenditures to report.

In order to adjust this reporting requirement to the prevailing level of values my amendment raises the cutoff amount of reporting from $50 to $100 during a calendar year and also provides that the filing of reports follow the general scheme of the new

bill. Therefore, under this amendment a person making a direct expenditure of $100 or more within a calendar year, other than by contributions to a political committee, in order to influence elections of candidates in two or more States, would have to report such expenditures.

I urge that this amendment be adopted and made part of the Federal Elections Act of 1959.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I offer another amendment. It is a technical amendment. It provides an overall limitation of $10,000. I send it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in the table of contents, it is proposed to strike out the heading of section 302 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

OVERALL LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL AID TO CANDIDATES OR POLITICAL COMMITTEES AND PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN PURCHASES

On page 17, strike out lines 4 and 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

OVERALL LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL AID TO CANDIDATES OR POLITICAL COMMITTEES AND PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN PURCHASES

On page 17, strike out lines 8 to 24, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 608. (a) Whoever, directly or indirectly, makes contributions or expenditures in an aggregate amount in excess of $10,000 during any calendar year, or in connection with any campaign for nomination or for election, for any or all of the following purposes—

(1) to or on behalf of any candidate or candidates for an elective Federal office or offices, including the offices of President and Vice President of the United States and presidential and vice-presidential electors, or

(2) to or on behalf of any committee or committees or other organizations engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate or candidates for any such office or offices or the success of any national political party, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

This subsection shall not apply to contributions or expenditures made by a political committee.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to establish an overall limitation on financial aid to candidates and political committees. The existing law contains a limitation. I wish to make it very clear that the limitation provided by present law is $5,000, but such may be contributed to any number of candidates or political committees. The amendment would provide a limitation of $10,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask a question. The most serious trouble in the past with that limitation has been that a wealthy family could give $5,000 in the name of every member of the family. Is that not true?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is exactly right.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Has the Senator done anything to tighten up that matter?

Mr. HENNINGS. We have done everything we could do by adopting amendments relating to the intrastate committees.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that we have been getting the reports, but that they are made after the elections, when everything is over?

Mr. HENNINGS. Under the present Corrupt Practices Act that has happened. I think that under the amendments which have been adopted and under the present bill there will be considerable improvement in that respect.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In the past, is it not true that a very wealthy man could give money to other individuals and they could give it to the committee and in that way put the money into the funds of the committee?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; that has been true.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. How, then, are we going to stop this giving of money to campaigns?

Mr. HENNINGS. We are trying to bring before the people the facts as they relate to the giving and spending of these moneys. The reporting features of the bill, as I have tried to say repeatedly, are the heart and soul of the philosophy and rationale of it. I would suggest to the Senator that at the present time there is a limitation of $5,000. The present law provides that no person shall directly or indirectly make contributions in an amount exceeding $5,000 during any calendar year to or on behalf of any candidate for nomination or election to Federal office, or to or on behalf of any committee furthering or advocating the election of any candidate to Federal office.

The law under which we are presumably now operating provides a $5,000 limitation. We would provide a limitation of $10,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That just gives a wealthy man a chance to give twice as much in the future. That is about all it does.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The explanation which the Senator has made of the amendment is not exactly in accordance with my understanding of it. I could well have a misunderstanding of what it would do. Do I understand that the amendment raises the present limit from $5,000 to $10,000, and nothing more?

Mr. HENNINGS. That is what I have tried to say. The present $5,000 limitation is not an overall limitation.

Mr. KEATING. It is not an overall limitation?

Mr. HENNINGS. It is a limitation, but not an overall limitation. The $10,000 would be an overall limitation.

Mr. KEATING. An overall limitation. So that for the first time we would be enacting an overall limitation on what any one individual could give, and we would make that overall limitation $10,000. Is that correct?

Mr. HENNINGS. I believe that is correct. The Senator has substantially stated the purpose of the amendment, and that in part answers the questions of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. KEATING. I personally support the amendment. I think it is a very important amendment, and it is important that in our deliberations we understand fully that this is quite a departure from anything now in the law. That was the purpose of my question.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad the Senator asked the question. Perhaps I should have taken more time to go into detail and explanation of the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this time?

Mr. HENNINGS. Inasmuch as so many Senators have been asking me when we are going to adjourn, because so many of them have commitments for this evening, I must apologize to my colleagues for having perhaps made a rather cursory statement, whereas I had prepared and am prepared now to make a full and complete and detailed statement. I am glad to answer any questions that may be submitted.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Missouri well knows that I voted for one of his amendments on the last yea and nay vote. I am not against all regulation of primary elections. But let me ask the Senator about this amendment. If it were adopted, would the bill not set a limitation of $10,000 on the amount a person could spend in support of his own candidacy?

Mr. HENNINGS. It would not be a limitation upon the candidate himself.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not think it would be proper to place a $10,000 limitation upon what a candidate can spend in support of his own candidacy.

Mr. HENNINGS. The provision will not apply to the candidate himself.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Suppose one of us happened to be running against a very wealthy person, and that person was willing to go the limit in paying his expenses to get himself elected. Then suppose a candidate who does not have a large sum of money available has a mother who would be willing to match the amount being spent by the wealthy opponent, or suppose he has a friend who would be willing to act as such a contributor. Do I correctly understand that a person who does not have sufficient money to match his opponent's own contribution would be foreclosed from accepting the contributions of his own mother, and that his mother could be sent to jail for making such a contribution?

Mr. HENNINGS. Under the bill, such a person's mother could establish a number of committees. They could be called the mother-for-son committee or the grandmother's committee or the sewing circle committee. There could be various committees of that type. There would be no limitation upon the amounts they could contribute, except that they would be required to report, which is the heart and soul of this proposal, as I have endeavored to point out before.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator's amendment simply require that contributions above $10,000 shall

be reported, or does it provide that there is a $10,000 limit on the amount which any person can give to a campaign?

Mr. HENNINGS. There is a $10,000 limit which any one person may give in an election year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Even if it happens to be the candidate's mother or father?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; the mother or father would be limited, of course, to that extent.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Even though that person himself might have no funds of any significance, but might be running against a very wealthy person?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; I am afraid that is the case.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the distinguished Senator not realize that it would be somewhat unfair to say that simply because one man has a large amount of money he is privileged to spend it; but the other man, by virtue of the fact that his mother is still living, and he has not had a chance to inherit some of her fortune, would not have a chance to match the expenditure of his opponent? I hope the Senator will answer that question.

Mr. HENNINGS. I cannot answer all questions. I have undertaken to say to the Senator that there are a good many factors involved. I appreciate the interest and support which the junior Senator from Louisiana has given to at least a part of the bill. But I cannot undertake to offer a solution for all the inequities in life, nor all the disparities, economic and otherwise, which exist in a free society.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But why create more? That is the point.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not think we are creating more. I think we are taking some of the enormous contributions out of political campaigns and are bringing them into line with what we think should be an emphasis upon the qualifications of the candidate, and not upon the number of interests, and their financial resources, which are supporting him.

We found, for example, in 1956, in the investigation conducted by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], that members of 12 prominent families contributed an over-all total of $1,153,000 to candidates and political committees, and that one family alone gave $248,423. Those contributions were lawful and within the letter of the law as it presently exists. Nevertheless, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana, it must be admitted that the possibility of influencing candidates or the results of elections is clear, in the light of such heavy contributions.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. From one's mother?

Mr. HENNINGS. I know that we often invoke mother and the flag, but I can scarcely see what mother had to do with this matter.

Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. GORE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield first to the Senator from California, who I believe was first on his feet.

Mr. KUCHEL. I desire to ask the Senator from Missouri if he plans to push this amendment to a vote tonight.

Mr. HENNINGS. I had hoped that we might discuss the amendment this evening. However, I would not do so over the opposition of Members of the Senate. I do not view myself as a dictator of what the Senate should do with relation to proceeding or adjourning. I was trying to expedite action on the bill. There are some other amendments which will be offered. I had four amendments of my own, this being the last of them. I have had inquiries from many Senators as to when we might adjourn tonight. I am in no hurry. So far as I am concerned, I can stay until midnight or morning. However, I would not like to subject any Senator to such procedure. I understand the assistant majority leader has indicated that some Senators desire to depart.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think I can give the assurance of the leadership on both sides that it was our hope that the debate on this measure for today could be concluded soon, so as to enable other Senators who have speeches to make, such as the Senator from Oregon, to deliver them before it gets too late.

Mr. HENNINGS. Members of the Senate have been, indeed, very generous to me in my entire time here. I would not undertake to do anything which would not comport with what other Senators may wish to do this evening; nor would I insist upon the further consideration of any amendment tonight. If it seems to be contrary to the will of the Senate, and if there is an indication that not a sufficient number of Senators are available either to develop a quorum or to debate further this amendment, I have no desire to insist upon further debate on the bill this evening.

Mr. KUCHEL. It is not my purpose to delay the Senate; but some Senators have already left with the understanding that there would be no further vote tonight. I apprehend that some Senators will oppose the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. As the acting minority leader, I simply wish to protect their rights to register objections. Under those circumstances, I hope the Senator from Missouri will not push the amendment to a vote tonight.

Mr. HENNINGS. Under those circumstances, I may say to the Senator from California, I would certainly not want to put any Senator, at any time, in a position of disadvantage or make him the victim of any misunderstanding with relation either to having a vote or further debate or discussion.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is a characteristically generous statement on the part of my friend, the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate the Senator's bringing the matter to my attention. I wish to conform to the will and the spirit of the Senate on this occasion, as I have tried to do throughout my service in this body.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will listen to this colloquy, I believe he will understand that the pending proposal is merely for an addition to the law, not a raising of the amount. The Senator from Tennessee, I believe, can shed light on the matter, due to the investigations he undertook as chairman of the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Montana is eminently correct. I shall be delighted to yield to the Senator from Tennessee for that purpose.

Mr. GORE. If I read the amendment aright, it would apply to the person making an expenditure out of his own pocket in support of his own campaign, as well as to the mother, so to speak, who might make an expenditure out of her own purse for the nomination or election of her son. Let me read:

> Whoever, directly or indirectly, makes contributions or expenditures in an aggregate amount in excess of $10,000 during any calendar year * * *.

So it seems to me that it would apply, alike, to the son, to the mother, or to the mother-in-law.

Mr. KUCHEL. What about the wife or the sweetheart?

Mr. HENNINGS. Under present law—if I may answer the question of the Senator from Louisiana—insofar as a friend or other person is concerned, the limitation is $5,000 to the candidate, and no more.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In view of the fact that other Members wish to delve further into this particular amendment, I suggest—if it will meet with the agreement of the Senate—that we now end our debate of today on the elections bill, and that the Senate now proceed to consider other matters, and thereafter adjourn until tomorrow, when we shall continue the debate on the elections bill.

Mr. GORE. First, Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. I should like to submit certain amendments, to be printed, lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD, if I may have unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is that course acceptable to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HENNINGS. Certainly. I may say that the Senator from Tennessee and I have discussed the offering of his amendments, and it was contemplated that they would be offered after the amendment now pending, which is the last of the amendments I had expected to offer, was acted on.

Mr. KUCHEL. Very well.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the Senator from California wish to ask questions at this time?

Mr. KUCHEL. No; I was merely asking about the procedure, not about the merits of the amendment. But I am sure other members will wish to ask some questions.

Mr. HENNINGS. I understand.

Then, Mr. President, consonant with the understanding with both the majority leader and the minority leader, I now yield the floor.

Mr. GORE. Then, Mr. President, I now submit amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to the pending bill. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 13, after line 21, insert the following:

"(c) Candidates for election as President and Vice President who are nominees of a political party, in their campaign for election, shall not make expenditures in excess of an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the largest number of voters casting votes for presidential electors in any one of the last three preceding elections. For the purpose of the limitation prescribed in this subsection, there shall be included the expenditures made by or on behalf of either or both candidates.

"(d) A candidate for nomination for the office of President or Vice President, in his campaign for such nomination, shall not make expenditures in an amount in excess of 50 per centum of the amount prescribed in subsection (c), above."

On page 13, line 22, strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)".

On page 8, line 8, beginning with the comma, strike out down to and including the comma on line 9, page 8.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the request of the Senator from Tennessee been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider certain nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will now be stated.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip McCallum, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that that nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

The legislative clerk proceeded to read two nominations to the Inter-American Development Bank.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT NOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate concludes its session tonight, it adjourn until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to submit some insertions for the RECORD relating to the current debate with respect to bills which are pending before us to increase the number of judges in the Federal courts. We are especially in need of such action in the southern district of New York.

I have before me a report on the need for six additional judges for the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, submitted by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York; the New York County Lawyers Association; the Bronx County Bar Association; the Empire State Chapter of the Federal Bar Association; the Maritime Law Association of the United States; and the New York Patent Law Association. This report is very persuasive and forceful, and shows clearly what the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I have been fighting for all these months. That is my reason for taking the time of the Senate at this time. I ask unanimous consent that this report may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with an editorial entitled, "Justice Versus Politics," published in the New York Times of January 20, 1960. The editorial approves the report, and shows that the southern district has 20 percent of the civil cases in all the Federal courts but only 7 percent of the total number of judges to hear them. We are far behind, and politics should not stand in the way of the administration of justice so urgently needed.

There being no objection, the report and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON THE NEED FOR SIX ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

The bar associations submitting this report are deeply concerned over a threatened breakdown in the administration of justice in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York because of an insufficient number of judges in that court to handle its ever-growing business. Our members, whose practice constitutes the primary work of the court, firmly believe that unless Congress promptly enacts legislation creating six additional judgeships for the southern district of New York, as recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States, such a breakdown may occur.

While the need for additional judges is a problem which is not confined to the southern district of New York alone, the southern district is unique in terms of the volume and character of the matters that come before it, and should be treated as such. Not only does this court handle a greater volume of business than any other Federal district court, but, situated as it is at the hub of the Nation's largest economic, shipping, and financial center, this court is constantly being called upon to decide matters of vital and unusual importance to the country at large—matters involving more complex and difficult factual and legal problems than those found on the dockets of most other Federal district courts. Such matters, whether disposed of before or after trial, inevitably require more time than the relatively simpler cases that characterize most other Federal dockets.

As of July 1, 1959, out of the Nation's total Federal civil caseload of 56,430[1] cases this district alone had pending before it 10,937 civil cases. But, as indicated above, bare statistical data concerning the number of cases pending does not give the full measure of judicial output because in this caseload there is an unusually large percentage of highly complicated matters which will take far more time to dispose of than the ordinary cases. This load includes:

Thirty-three Government antitrust cases, or over one-third such cases pending in the country; 237 patent suits, constituting almost one-fifth of all such cases in the United States; 2,376 admiralty proceedings (exclusive of Jones Act personal injury cases), representing over two-fifths of all admiralty matters on file in the Federal courts; and 117 private antitrust suits, or about 20 percent of all such litigation in

[1] Unless otherwise noted, all figures are taken from the Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., September 1959.

the Federal courts; and approximately 25 Robinson-Patman Act cases.[2]

Likewise high is the percentage of other cases that involve complex fields of industry, services, and enterprises, ranging from bottled baby foods and bananas to copyright music, watches, radio tubes, computers, television broadcasting, color photography, and prizefight promotion. These suits are of the type referred to colloquially by bench and bar as "the big case." Estimates of trial time required range from several weeks to almost a year per case, and the amounts of damages claimed run in many cases to over a million dollars each.

The implications of this unique type of caseload may be gathered by reference to some examples. In the admiralty field, for instance, the much publicized limitation of liability proceedings affecting the SS *Andrea Doria* and the MV *Stockholm* are recorded statistically as only two cases. However, they actually represent a vast number of separate suits, one for each claim, and in these two cases there were approximately 3,500 claims filed, many of which involved settlement of infants' and deceased persons' claims.

The recent Bethlehem-Youngstown steel merger case, a Government antitrust suit tried in the southern district before Judge Edward Weinfeld in 1958, is another typical example. There a motion for summary judgment (see *United States* v. *Bethlehem Steel Corp.*, 157 F. Supp. 877 for decision) required the court to consider affidavits, exhibits and briefs exceeding 400 pages. Despite complete cooperation on all sides to shorten the trial through pretrial conferences and stipulations (one of which was 600 pages long) the trial record ran to 12,000 pages and required the judge to spend a very substantial part of 6 months in chambers before handing down an 88-page decision (at 168 F. Supp. 576), plus 199 pages of findings of fact and conclusions of law.

The statistics in the Government suit against the investment bankers, *United States* v. *Henry S. Morgan et al.*, 118 F. Supp. 621 (SDNY 1953), tried before Judge Medina, reveal the true character of the "big case." That case involved 6,848 pages of pretrial depositions, interrogatories, and orders, 10,640 pretrial exhibits, consisting of 43,252 pages, 196 pretrial and interim motions, briefs and memorandums, plus 376 separate charts and tables prepared by the parties, totaling 3,846 pages; 309 courtroom days of trial, plus 25 days of off-the-record conferences between court and counsel; 23,962 printed pages of trial transcript; 4,469 trial exhibits totaling 20,474 pages plus 2,967 pages marked for identification; and 417 pages devoted to the court's opinion.

Yet the Morgan case would be counted as but one case in statistical records.

In his Field Study of the Operations of the U.S. courts—report to Senate Appropriations Committee, April 1959, Mr. Paul J. Cotter, stated that "the problem of the complicated case exists to a high degree" in this district, and that it has the largest number of "long and complicated cases" in the country. Such litigation demands much more of a judge's time and intellect than the hours spent on the trial itself. Before trial the parties usually present difficult factual and legal questions by way of a series of motions accompanied by voluminous papers and briefs which must be studied for a considerable length of time in chambers before they can intelligently be decided. During trial many more hours must be spent analyzing minutes and exhibits and preparing jury charges; and in nonjury cases (which are customary in the complicated patent and admiralty proceedings, and in many antitrust suits) the judge must after the trial study the exhibits, transcript and briefs before drafting and filing his findings, conclusions, and opinion.

In addition to the many protracted cases on its civil docket, the southern district of New York has also been the venue for an unusually large number of so-called big criminal cases, such as the recently concluded Apalachin trial and the Genovese narcotics case which was tried in April 1959. It should be noted that the southern district handles approximately 1,100 criminal prosecutions annually, which cannot be deferred, since the Constitution guarantees the accused a prompt disposition; and that this consumes the full time of four judges, making them unavailable for civil cases.

To handle this enormous and complex case load, which in sheer numbers constitutes 20 percent of the civil cases pending in all the Federal district courts, Congress has allocated to the southern district of New York only 18 judges, or 7 percent of the total number of Federal district judges in the country. According to the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Warren Olney, III, "No district is as undermanned as the southern district of New York.

The 10,937 pending cases in the southern district breaks down to an average of 608 cases pending per judge. There are twelve Federal districts, including the southern district of New York, which have five or more judges. All of these districts are located in metropolitan areas and handle approximately 45 percent of all new civil cases filed in the 86 districts having purely Federal jurisdiction.[3] The average case load pending before each judge in these 12 districts was 321 cases as of June 30, 1959. In other words, each of the judges in the southern district of New York has on the average almost twice the number of cases pending before him as the judges of these other metropolitan districts. The situation as of June 30, 1958 was much the same: At that time, in the same twelve metropolitan districts, the average number of cases pending per judge was 336, while in the southern district of New York the average case load per judge was 578. And the average caseload of the judges in all 86 districts having exclusive Federal jurisdiction was 249 and 270 in those years.

Of course, if this unduly large number of cases pending per judge in the southern district of New York could be attributed to inefficiency or a lack of industriousness on the part of its judges, the creation of additional judgeships obviously would not be the solution to the problem. But the record establishes conclusively that this is not the case. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the judges in the southern district of New York on the average disposed of 334 cases per judge, as compared to an average of 253 cases per judge in the 12 metropolitan districts described above. A comparison for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, likewise reveals that the southern district disposed of a substantially greater number of cases per judge than the average of the other metropolitan districts. The average number of cases disposed of per judge for all 86 districts having exclusive Federal jurisdiction was even lower. In 1959 the figure was 236 cases disposed of per judge, and in 1958 the average number of cases disposed of per judge was 231.

Yet, despite the fact that through a prodigious effort the judges in the southern district of New York disposed of a much higher than average number of cases in both 1958 and 1959, their caseload continues to swell. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, 6,732[4] new cases were filed in the southern district and 4,896[4] cases were disposed of. Last year 6,549 new cases were filed and a total of 6,011 cases disposed of. Thus, from July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1959, the backlog of pending cases has increased by 2,374 cases in this district even though its judges are working harder than ever. Any further efforts to increase the output per judge pose the risk that judges will be forced unconsciously to sacrifice the quality of justice expected of them in an effort to keep up with the increasing workload. There is a limit to the burden that can be handled efficiently, even by the most conscientious judge. If he exceeds that limit his very attempt to keep up with the excessive burden is self-defeating since mental exhaustion will undoubtedly have an adverse effect upon all of his work, not just the excess.

The steady increase in this district's backlog does not completely reflect the seriousness of the situation. With an inadequate number of judges to handle the entire caseload before it, there is a natural tendency on the part of the court to dispose of the shorter cases first and defer the more complicated and protracted ones, since trial of these cases would consume months of the time of the judges involved and result in a sharp increase in the number of cases forming the backlog. This tendency to handle the shorter cases first, however, increases the hard core of the protracted and complicated cases, especially when one realizes that from 2 to 3 percent of the current filings, or approximately 150 new cases each year are of the complicated and protracted type. Recently Chief Judge Ryan has assigned four or five complicated and protracted cases, apiece, for all purposes, to each of the 18 judges and we may therefore expect that when trial of some of these cases is commenced in 1960 the delay in handling of regular run of the mill cases will be increased.

Nor have efforts on the part of Congress to stem the engulfing tide of new cases being brought in the Federal courts met with success in the southern district of New York. When Congress passed the Jurisdictional Act of July 25, 1958, which raised the minimum jurisdictional amount from $3,000 to $10,000 in diversity cases, it was anticipated that this would result in a sharp decrease in the number of such cases being brought in the Federal courts, because, of the 67,115 cases filed during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, throughout the United States, 25,709 were diversity cases. From the standpoint of the country as a whole, the statute had its desired effect since there was an overall decline of 32.6 percent in the number of such cases filed in the fiscal year 1959. Unfortunately, this decline occurred in districts other than the southern district of New York. In this district, while the number of private civil cases filed in the fiscal year 1959 declined slightly from the previous year (5,388 filed in 1959 as compared to 5,764 filed in 1958), the total number of civil cases commenced in the southern district for 1959 remained substantially the same as it was in 1958, viz, 6,549 as compared with 6,727.[5] Furthermore, an examination of the docket in the southern district

[2] Estimated by Chief Judge Sylvester J. Ryan.

[3] These are Massachusetts, the eastern and southern districts of New York, New Jersey, the eastern and western districts of Pennsylvania, the southern district of Florida, the eastern district of Michigan, the northern district of Ohio, and the northern district of Illinois, and the northern and southern districts of California.

[4] Field Study of the Operations of U.S. Courts—Report to Senate Appropriations Committee, April 1959, prepared by Paul S. Cotter.

[5] 365 civil cases per judge were filed in the southern district in the fiscal year 1959 as compared with an average of 238 such cases per judge in the 12 largest Federal districts in the country (including the southern district of New York).

for the first 4 months of the current fiscal year (1959–60) reveals that 2,357 new civil cases have been filed, or an average of approximately 600 suits per month, which would mean that we may expect the total for the current year to exceed 7,100 new civil actions.

Thus, while the number of civil actions being commenced in most other districts is on the decline, the number in the southern district of New York is still increasing despite the new act. It should also be noted that the great majority of cases pending in the southern district consist principally of private civil suits rather than suits by or against the Government, a fact of considerable significance in assessing the court's workload, since it is generally accepted that "private civil cases * * * take much more time of the judges than Government cases." [6]

Other new Federal legislation enacted by Congress at its last session may also lead to additional litigation in the Southern District of New York. One example of this legislation is the Labor-Management Report and Disclosure Act of 1959 (the so-called Landrum-Griffin bill) enacted in September 1959 (Public Law 86–257) which establishes new controls affecting labor unions and their relationships with union members. Both labor and management representatives have predicted that this act will lead to a flood of litigation by individual union members and employees seeking to enforce rights accorded them under the law. The southern district of New York, which is the situs of the headquarters of many important unions will undoubtedly be invoked in such cases. We may further anticipate that future sessions of Congress will pass additional legislation in other fields that will likewise add to this important court's burden.

What has been the result thus far of this tremendous caseload in the southern district? The median interval between issue and trial in this district during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959 was 19.1 months as distinguished from an average median interval of 10.3 months in the 86 districts having exclusive Federal jurisdiction. And the time between the filing of a complaint and trial was 26.7 months in the southern district as compared with 15.3 months in these same 86 districts during that same period.

The delay of over 26 months between filing and trial in the southern district causes hardships to litigants and brings the court into disrepute in the eyes of the public. In patent infringement cases, for example, this inordinate delay has serious consequences for it has encouraged willful and wanton infringement of important patents toward the end of their term. Infringers, secure in the knowledge that if suit is brought in the Southern District of New York no determination of the issues involved is probable until after the expiration date of the patent, have deliberately embarked on infringement activities toward the end of the term of many patents, thus foreshortening the effective term of such patents by several years.

In areas of industry engaged in highly competitive research, patented inventions frequently become obsolete in a matter of years; and in these areas the value of a patent is seriously reduced if speedy relief against infringers is not available, and absent value in the patent, the incentive for invention and development of new products disappears.

But the problem in the Southern District of New York is far more serious than one of delay alone. If the present rate of filings continues without abatement, or increases as the first four months of 1959–1960 indicate will be the case, and the court is given no relief in the form of new judges, we face a deterioration in the very quality of justice that this distinguished court will be able to dispense in the future. Because it is inevitable that when the caseload on the individual judges becomes too heavy, not only does court congestion occur, but the quality of the justice which is dispensed must ultimately be adversely affected.

We believe that this problem cannot be met by measures short of the enactment of legislation creating six additional judgeships. The court has welcomed any reasonable alternative suggestions including the use of visiting judges from other districts and the adoption of various procedural reforms calculated to increase the court's work product. But past experience has shown that the services of visiting judges, although welcomed with open arms, have limited utility since their help is of a temporary and transitory nature and they cannot therefore be assigned to deal with the court's No. 1 problem which is the extraordinary number of complicated and protracted cases pending on its calendar. These judges invariably return after a few weeks to their respective home districts which are often hundreds or thousands of miles from New York. To ask them to continue to handle a matter after they have returned to their home districts would not only be unfair to them and to the lawyers and litigants involved, but would also be impractical.

With respect to procedural reforms, efforts are continually being made toward improving the court's efficiency. These include studies presently under way, of measures designed to eliminate waste of time on the part of the court and counsel in the hearing and disposition of motions, and of possible revisions in the court's pretrial procedures. Even with such improvements, however, the court could never expect to increase its already prodigious work product to a point where it could keep abreast of the annual intake of new cases, much less to dispose of the huge backlog of pending litigation before it.

After reviewing the manner in which the present 18 judges are assigned, we are convinced that a minimum of 6 additional judgeships is required to enable the court to keep up with the current annual inflow of civil and criminal business. Any plan for assignments of the 24 judges would still necessitate continuation of the services of retired senior and visiting judges who would be utilized on shorter trials in order to enable a portion of the regularly assigned judges to handle the many complicated and protracted cases instituted in this district. Adequate space and facilities are available to accommodate the six additional judges recommended.

On behalf of our members we urge Congress as strongly as we can to enact promptly legislation creating six additional judgeships for the southern district of New York before the problem has grown to such gargantuan proportions that the damage will be irreparable.

DECEMBER 31, 1959.

[6] Quarterly Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts for the Third Quarter of the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1959, p. 8, table C–1; testimony of Warren Olney III, Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, Jan. 26, 1959, Hearings before the Subcommittee of the House of Appropriations, 86th Cong., 1st sess., p. 56.

JUSTICE VERSUS POLITICS

The city bar association's report on the need for six additional Federal judgeships in this southern district of New York raises a clearcut issue of justice versus politics. That it exists at all is a disgrace, made worse as the situation grows increasingly acute. The bar association has done a conspicuous service, to the public and to frustrated litigants, in its able presentation of the case for more judges—one which we hope will have a massive impact on Congress, where responsibility for the present situation squarely rests.

So remiss has Congress been in meeting the demands of swift justice in this district that the parties in civil actions now have to wait more than 2 years before their cases come to trial. As the report has pointed out, the delay causes hardships to litigants and brings the court into disrepute; in patent cases it has encouraged willful and wanton infringement. The outstanding cause for this deplorable situation is the failure of Congress to create enough judgeships, as the years have gone by, to keep up with the increase in cases that the court has had to handle.

The flood of cases has risen no less than 36 percent in the last 5 years, with the same number of judges to carry the load. And their burden is greater than that which judges in other districts have to bear. The southern district has 20 percent of the civil cases in all the Federal courts, but only 7 percent of the total number of judges to hear them. No wonder the New York court has failed by 2,374 to keep up in decisions with the new cases filed in the past 2 years.

While the situation is more acute here than elsewhere it is urgent everywhere. For the past 5 years the Judicial Conference of the United States has been urging Congress to create more judgeships—raising the number as conditions have grown steadily worse. But no action at all has been taken. Now a bill for 45 more places on the Federal bench is gathering dust in congressional committee rooms. Reason: the politics of possible appointments. And this in spite of the fact that President Eisenhower has pledged to appoint to new places an equal number of Democrats and Republicans qualified for the judgeships.

Could it be that leaders of the Democratic majority hope a Democratic President, bound by no such pledge, will be elected next year, or that some fear that President Eisenhower might not appoint the right kind of Democrats? Anyway, the delay is inexcusable.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am very happy that my colleague has called our attention again to this crying need. A bill has been reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary which would at least help somewhat with the problem. I reiterate my hope that the leadership of the Senate will schedule the bill for early consideration. The need is very urgent.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] will remember that at our last meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary this matter was taken up and discussed. At that time it was brought out that I had reported the bill from the committee. I said it was not all that we would like to do, and that it was more or less a compromise bill. The whole committee understood at that time that we hoped to get the bill under consideration at an early date.

Mr. KEATING. I am well aware of the fact that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, as chairman of the subcommittee which deals with these matters, has been helpful in reporting

the bill which is now on the calendar. He recognizes, as well as the rest of us, that it does not fully solve the problem. I do hope the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who is chairman of one of the important committees of the Senate, and whose relationship to the leadership is of the highest, and who has great persuasive powers in this body, will use his powers of persuasion with the majority leader and with the assistant majority leader and the policy committee of the Democratic Party in the Senate, to get the bill before us so that we can vote on it. I feel sure that it will receive widespread support, if only we can get it to the floor and let the Senate work its will.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not wish to delay a vote on the pending amendment. My colleague from New York and I have made our case, and it is made very eloquently in the inserts that I have submitted for the RECORD. It is a matter of utmost statesmanship that this be done. It is one of the urgent needs of the country. The people feel it very keenly, whether they are litigants or prospective litigants. I join with my colleague in the expectation that we shall have action on the bill.

FEDERAL CONTROLS OVER STATE VOTING REGISTRATION MACHINERY AND CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, there is now under way a great deal of study in an effort to find ways and means for the Federal Government to intervene in the election powers of the various States. Those who promote such intervention also seek to force undesirable civil rights legislation upon the people of the various States.

At the present time the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration is holding hearings on proposed legislation to enact a Federal registration program. For some days there has been on the floor of the Senate, debate on a so-called Federal clean elections bill. In the Judiciary Committee and elsewhere there are rumblings about civil rights legislation in nearly every field one could imagine.

All this talk about civil rights and Federal controls over elections and registration machinery is political vote baiting and, in actuality, has no place in the Congress of the United States. The control of elections or of the social habits of the people, or of the conduct of public schools has always been reserved, by the Constitution of the United States, to the local and the State governments.

The Senate has no more right to tell people in Alaska or California or Maine what to do in their elections than do those States have a right to tell the U.S. Senate how it shall conduct its business.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that we should stick to our business in the U.S. Senate, and should not delve into the business of the local or the State governments.

The Federal Government—whether the executive branch, the judicial branch, or either House of the legislative branch—has no business butting into State primary elections or State general elections. As I understand, there is no such thing as a Federal election; all elections are State elections. The Constitution of the United States provides that the people in every State shall have the right to elect. But the Constitution leaves to the States the right to control the elections.

When a President of the United States is elected, the people of each State vote to elect the delegates of their choice, who then decide upon who will be the President and the Vice President. This is done through State elections, not a national election.

The Constitution of the United States expressly reserves to the States the power and right to control elections. Within my lifetime, U.S. Senators from South Carolina and Senators from many other States, for example, were elected by the general assemblies of the various States, not by popular vote. The States have always decided election matters and registration matters; and any attempt by the U.S. Senate, or the House of Representatives, or any other Federal body or agency to change this rule would be an attempt to change the Constitution of the United States.

While on the subject of Federal Government intervention in State affairs and the general field of civil rights, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an editorial entitled "Terror In New York," from the News and Courier, of Charleston, S.C., dated January 18, 1960. I commend this editorial for reading by all Senators; and with particular emphasis do I recommend a reading of a letter to the editor, published in the same issue of this newspaper, and upon which the editorial was based. The letter to the editor, written by a New York resident, is supported by a news item entitled "Women In Panic—Attack Victims Tell of Terror." The editorial, the letter to the editor, and the article from the New York Journal-American, as referred to in an editor's note, all emphasize that those who cry loudest for civil rights action have not yet learned to control the problems of their own communities.

The strongest proponents for Federal intervention in State registration and voting matters and for interfering in State matters, through civil-rights legislation, come from the large cities where the greatest racial problems exist and where there are more local civil-rights statutes on the books than anywhere else in the Nation.

I hope the Members of the Senate will think more than twice before they vote for legislation that attempts to interfere with the rights of States covering elections, registration programs, and other matters.

I, for one, stand ready, as a South Carolinian, to defend the civil rights of citizens in South Carolina as quickly as anyone else in this Nation. But I do not have a right to tell the people of New York what to do in this or in any other field; and the people of New York or any other State have no right to tell the people of South Carolina or any other State, what to do, regardless of the attempts that are made directly or indirectly through the Congress, the President of the United States, or elsewhere in the Federal Government.

I stand ready to defend the voting rights of every citizen in South Carolina; and I stand equally prepared to defend the rights of South Carolinians, New Yorkers, Californians, and the people of all other States to control their own voting machinery.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and the other two items to which I referred, from the News and Courier, be printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial, letter, and editor's note were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Jan. 18, 1960]

TERROR IN NEW YORK

Not long ago a local reader accused us of exaggerating crime conditions in New York, where the list of attacks, especially on women, is constantly growing. Elsewhere on this page today appears a letter from a woman who says that nobody feels safe in the metropolis and that we have not misrepresented conditions.

Neither correspondent, of course, sets up to be an authority on these conditions. Both speak from personal observations.

Our comments are based on constant reading of newspapers, magazines, and official reports, and on conversations with informed persons in different parts of the country. Out of all this we have gathered an impression of virtual jungles in several cities of the North and West.

Much of this wave of violence is attributed to Negroes. For this reason we have related the outbreak of disorder to racial conditions.

Some observers believe that incoming migrants, both from the Southern States and from Puerto Rico, have set up new tensions that lead to crime. Our purpose in focusing attention on these disturbing conditions is to show that racial problems are more acute in the North than in the South, which is the target of hostile propaganda.

We are well aware that the South has too much crime, but in our judgment it is better controlled today than in northern cities where terror stalks citizens, principally women. Even the paper curtain press now is taking notice.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Jan. 19, 1960]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR—WOMEN IN PANIC

BAY SHORE, N.Y.

To the News and Courier:

A letter, saying that the News and Courier exaggerates crime in New York, written by Chalmers S. Murray, has been forwarded to me and I can assure Mr. Murray that the conditions he mentions are not exaggerated but are even worse than is recorded in newspapers. No one is safe anywhere here and all are afraid.

I've lived in New York for many years, and know Charleston well and know of conditions there too, but at present things here are almost out of control, so please don't underestimate.

ADELE GARFIELD.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Enclosed with the foregoing letter was a news item from the New York Journal-American captioned "Women in Panic—Attack Victims Tell of Terror." The item says: "Fear is gripping the women of New York today. Their terror comes with the gray of dusk as muggers and rapists roam the streets. Only yesterday a subway change agent was added to the mounting list of assaults on women. What is happening in our town? To get at the facts, the New York Journal-American sent out a team of reporters to observe at first hand the march of fear. This is the first of a series revealing why the women of New York City are

now 'Women in Panic.'" The letter from Mr. Chalmers S. Murray of Edisto Island said that he had not been molested in numerous visits to New York, and that the News and Courier was exaggerating the dangers.)

NEWSPAPER STRIKE IN PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I entered into an understanding with the leadership of the Senate and with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] that I would forgo making the speech I am about to make until after the debate for today on the clean elections bill was held, because again, as has always been my practice, I desired to cooperate with the leadership and the Senator in charge of any bill in expediting debate on that bill—particularly when the speech I make tonight is a speech not only for the RECORD, but one that needs to be read and studied by Members of the Senate, and needs to have adequate consideration given to its very serious import and the serious labor relations problem that it raises.

Mr. President, I propose to discuss for a few minutes the newspaper strike which has been raging in the city of Portland, Oreg., for the past 11 weeks. In all my years in the State of Oregon, through such labor strife as we have had from time to time, including some serious strikes on occasions on the waterfront, I have never witnessed such vicious antilabor employer conduct as I have witnessed on the part of the publishers and editors of the Portland Journal and the Oregonian in connection with this newspaper strike.

By way of an introduction to my speech, Mr. President, I think it is particularly appropriate that I read at this time a very short television speech I prepared for release in the State of Oregon on the strike. It reads as follows:

Fellow Oregonians, on this telecast, I am pleased to respond to the invitation of the Portland newspaper strike committee to give my views and suggestions on the union-busting controversy that is raging in Portland between the Newhouse newspaper chain dynasty and free workers in our city.

I have refrained from making a statement until I received this invitation from the Portland newspaper strike committee, because I am well aware of the very deep political hatred for me held by the publishers and the editors of both the Portland Journal and the Oregonian. However, this controversy has now reached the point where the public interest has become paramount. What I say on this telecast may not be acceptable in all details to either the newspapers or the strikers. But I want to point out that we have now reached the point where the public interest must be given first consideration.

Some weeks ago Governor Hatfield and Senator NEUBERGER made a very fine statement and proposal when they suggested that a factfinding board be appointed to find out what the facts are in regard to this controversy.

As some of our religious leaders in Portland, such as Dr. Steiner, have pointed out, the public is bound to get only biased and slanted news from one of the participants in this controversy, namely, the newspaper publishers themselves. It is about time that we have the facts presented to the public, and in view of the fact that the newspapers have turned down Governor Hatfield and Senator NEUBERGER's suggestion, I want to add a suggestion to what Hatfield and NEUBERGER have already proposed.

I would like to point out that the best labor law on the statute books today is undoubtedly the Railway Labor Act of 1926; it provides for the appointment when there is a deadlock reached of an emergency board, and that emergency board has the duty of finding the facts and making recommendations for the solution of the dispute.

Now the Railway Labor Act is not a compulsory arbitration act. It does not require either party to be bound by the recommendations of the emergency board.

But what has happened in practice? After the emergency board has made its recommendations for a fair solution of a dispute, then the general public becomes the final arbitrator. What we need in this case are recommendations from an impartial fact-finding board with power to recommend, that will give the public the facts and give the public proposals for a fair settlement of the dispute. As in most of the railway disputes, I am satisfied that if we followed this procedure, the public, as the final arbitrator, would bring great pressure to bear on both the publishers and the workers to accept such a fair settlement.

Now who should make this kind of a fact-finding recommendation proposal? Well, I would like to suggest that such a fact-finding recommending board be headed by the dean of the School of Journalism of the University of Oregon, and that perhaps seven other schools of journalism across this country be asked to name someone from their faculty to sit on such a board, put all their names in a hat and draw out three or five depending upon the number that would be most acceptable to the parties.

Now that certainly would give you an impartial board. That would give you a board that understands the newspaper industry, and that would give you a board of fair-minded men who would put the public interest into this dispute where it belongs.

Let us take a look at some of the issues involved in it. I think it is a sad thing that these newspapers have brought into our State, a State with high labor standards, a State that believes in good wages for our workers, known professional strikebreakers. There is no doubt about this antiunion busting activity on the part of the publishers of the Journal and the Oregonian. It is an old pattern and technique by the Newhouse newspaper chain dynasty. We need to keep in mind the fact that Samuel Newhouse is not really a newspaperman. He is basically a financier; he is not interested—it is demonstrated in his operations in other States—he is not interested in newspapers; he is interested in what newspapers can make for him by way of profit.

And I think it is a sad thing that the journalistic profession in our State has reached the low that Newhouse has brought to it in the State of Oregon. But those are facts that need to be brought out by an impartial board. Let Newhouse come on in and defend his practices in St. Louis and his practices in some eastern States.

Let us take a moment on this matter of strike insurance. It needs to be pointed out, of course, that publishers couldn't even get their insurance policies registered in the State of New York, because the officials of the State of New York found that this practice is against sound public policy. There is no doubt as to what it is; it is one of the union-busting techniques that combinations of newspaper employers think that they can develop in order to break the newspaper unions. So they had to go to Canada to get a foreign company to give them this kind of insurance.

But I want the people of Oregon to remember that these so-called strikers, who are just as locked out as they are striking, are your neighbors. They send their children to the same schools that your children go to. They go to the same churches. They are men and women who are deserving of the freedom that has been built up over the years in connection with the right of free men and women to collectively bargain for wages, hours, and conditions of employment. The people of Oregon are entitled to know what the facts are in regard to this dispute.

But there is one issue that I want to comment on very briefly, because I think it is very unfortunate that the publishers of the Journal and the Oregonian are guilty of such deception as they have been guilty of in the propaganda against the neewspapermen and women who are on strike in their plants.

They would have you believe that these newspaper workers of theirs are bound contractually to go through a picket line and scab on their fellow workers. It so happens that on March 2, 1939, when I was arbitrating maritime disputes on the west coast, I handed down the first decision in American labor arbitration law, that at least was known at that time, on a very important legal principle that I want to briefly discuss, because it gives the lie to the argument of the editors and publishers of the Oregonian and the Journal.

The case I decided was really based, as far as my decision was concerned, on some great language written by Justice Louis Brandeis back in 1910 before he went to the U.S. Supreme Court and while he was active in the field of labor relations. This case, March 2, 1939, that I decided involved a strike of the so-called clerks and checkers union at Encinal Terminal in the San Francisco Bay. As a result of the strike, not a ship was moving in San Francisco Bay. Why? Because the longshoremen refused to go through the checkers and clerks picket line; a picket line that was stretched in a good-faith labor dispute at Encinal Terminal. The ship owners took the position that under the contract with the Longshoremen they were bound to perform the work as ordered by the employer. After taking long, voluminous testimony on this matter, I handed down a decision on March 2, 1939, which has become a classic in American labor arbitration law, has been followed by many arbitrators since, and has never been upset by the courts. In that decision, and I read from it, I said:

"In the absence of an express agreement that the longshoremen would pass through the picket line of another union on strike, it is to be implied that both parties to the agreement of October 1, 1938, knew or should have known that the longshoremen would not pass through such a picket line. There are certain basic tenets of unionism, a knowledge of which can be reasonably charged to all employers. As pointed out by counsel for the union at the hearing, one of the cardinal principles of unionism is that a union will not permit itself to be used as the means of breaking the strength of another union which at the time is out on strike. The sanctity of picket lines is basic in the teaching and practice of American unionism.

"The arbitrator is compelled by the record in this case, and by a careful analysis of the agreement, to accept the view that the Waterfront Employers Association knew, or should have known, when they entered into the agreement of October 1, 1938, that if a strike situation involving such facts as existed at the Encinal Terminal on February 18, 1939, should arise, the longshoremen, under the agreement, would not be expected or required to go through the picket line."

I say most respectfully that the publishers and editors of the Portland Journal and the Oregonian knew, or should have known, when they entered into collective bargaining agreements with these newspaper unions that no self-respecting union man or woman is going

to scab on a sister union by walking through a good-faith picket line. There is no question about the fact that the stereotypers went out in a good-faith strike over wages, hours, and conditions of employment. No one can expect self-respecting union men or women to scab on the stereotypers union.

So we must face up to the fact that what really is involved basically in this controversy is another attempt on the Newhouse dynasty to set up an open shop in the newspapers of Portland; to subject workers in this great journalistic profession to all the harassment that goes along with an open shop; to the lowering of wages and hours and conditions of employment.

Now it does not follow, may I say, that they are not some merits on the employers side on some of these issues. I have never known a major labor dispute yet that was all one way, but what we need now is to get a relaxation of tension; to set up a tribunal where the rules of reason will prevail and where both sides can come in before an impartial board, present the facts, let that board present the facts and its report to the public with the recommendations as to how the dispute ought to be settled—recommendations not binding upon either side as it is not binding the railroad industry. But my prediction is that if a board really conducts an impartial judicial hearing on this matter, and makes recommendations documented to the evidence presented to the board, the public will back up the board. Both the publishers and the union will recognize that it is in the public interest to voluntarily accept the recommendations of the board.

The time has come for industrial statesmanship on the part of both sides in this controversy and it is the recommendation that I make to both sides.

Mr. President, I have read this brief telecast speech as an introduction to the comments which I shall now make, which will not in themselves take very long, either. I think that short telecast speech summarizes pretty well the operative fact situation which has the city of Portland, Oreg.—and, in fact, our whole State—very much concerned not only about what has happened to good labor relations in the newspaper industry, but also with respect to the effect of the strike on labor relations in other industries.

If the Newhouse dynasty succeeds in breaking these newspaper unions in Portland, it will be but encouragement and inducement for other antilabor employers in our State—and we have our fair share—to try to undercut and destroy unions in their plants, and, second, to set up an open-shop movement in the State of Oregon. So I wish to make some additional comments in regard to this very sad situation.

This labor dispute, as I have said, involves Portland's two daily newspapers, the Oregonian and the Journal. Pitted against each other in this long drawn-out controversy are two contrasting economic groups.

On the one hand we have the employees, who with their families are local residents. They are our neighbors. They attend our churches. They go to our schools. They are employees who possess special skills in the typographical field, many of them having devoted most of their lives to those jobs. They are in Oregon today, as they will be when the dispute is finally settled.

On the other hand we have the Oregonian and the Journal, a daily newspaper monopoly of Portland, whose editorial policies and practices are almost indistinguishable. These papers are in effect one side of the coin. There are no daily newspaper opponents in Portland. This monopoly is dominated by the Oregonian, a member of the financial empire of the Newhouse chain of eastern newspapers and television stations. This monopoly is aided and abetted by mercenaries, imported strikebreakers, hired from the far corners of the Nation, who perform the work of professional strikebreakers. These mercenaries are paid handsomely to take over the jobs of responsible local residents.

In fact, Mr. President, these mercenaries are being put up, for the most part in one or two hotels in Portland, where all their expenses are paid and where they live in concert, Mr. President, in this nefarious occupation of theirs, the occupation of professional strikebreakers.

It is interesting to note that almost immediately after the strike broke out early in November the publishers installed strikebreakers imported from other States, some from as far away as Florida, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Ohio, and Massachusetts. Many are known to be professional strikebreakers.

Toward the end of my speech I shall ask permission to have printed in the RECORD certain documentation with regard to these strikebreakers, and certain documentation in regard to a professional business organization, surprisingly enough, Mr. President, which exists in this country to supply newspapers with traveling strikebreakers.

There is much evidence and documentation, which I shall later point out, that many months ago some of the strikebreakers in other parts of the country, in conversation, said to people from Oregon who were visiting in the parts of the country where the strikebreakers were at that time, that they expected to be in Portland in a matter of a few months.

There is much evidence that here again, as Newhouse has done elsewhere, there has been a longtime, thorough preparation of the economic warfare that he is conducting against the free men and women who belong to the newspaper unions in Portland.

As I intended to say later—I might as well say it now—I think the Portland case gives us the pilot case which calls upon the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to proceed with an investigation of antiunion practices on the part of certain newspaper publishers. That involves the question of hiring professional strikebreakers, the question of transporting them, paying their expenses, and housing them in the area of the struck newspaper, and the question of strike insurance, about which I shall speak a little later in this speech tonight.

In my judgment these matters call for a thorough investigation by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and in due course of time I shall submit a resolution calling for such an investigation. It is not intended to be an investigation limited to the Portland situation, but the Portland situation will be but an example of the need for a thorough nationwide investigation as to what certain antilabor newspaper publishers in this country are up to.

I believe that here, too, the public needs the facts. I am perfectly willing to rely on the final judgment of fairness on the part of the public as the final arbiter in regard to these newspaper publisher practices.

I wish to stress that this is a typical technique and strategy used by the Newhouse empire when it sets out to try to break a newspaper union.

In all good humor I should point out that the Oregonian and the Journal have not been friendly to me since 1952. They have been sticking their poisonous editorial pens into my blood for some years now, and writing uncomplimentary editorials and attacks upon me. Because I feel those newspapers would not welcome any suggestions, I have not publicly expressed an opinion on the newspaper strike until today. I did not want in any way to follow a course of action which anyone could interpret as one which might in the slightest degree make a bad situation worse for the free men and women in the newspaper industry who are out on strike.

However, when the strike committee of the strikers asked me to prepare a television speech on this subject, I agreed to break my silence; and although I have not been making any public statements in regard to the Portland newspaper strike situation, I have been keeping myself thoroughly informed, and in some instances have given my advice and judgment in respect to some of the issues involved.

I would have the people of Oregon and Members of the Senate keep in mind the account of the views I offer on the floor of the Senate tonight concerning the strike, and my suggestions concerning action which might lead to a fair settlement of the dispute.

By and large, the people of Oregon have been given a partisan report as to the merits of the positions taken by the opposing parties. That has been true because practically the only media of newspaper information available to the people of Oregon have been, of course, the newspapers of these publishers, whose employees are out on strike.

It is very interesting to know what has happened. When the strike started the Portland Journal and the Oregonian joined forces. The Journal moved its operations over to the Oregonian building, and they are publishing a joint newspaper.

There are many rumors with respect to which I do not know the facts, as to what the business strategy is in regard to this remarkable merger of the two antiunion newspapers. The Journal publishers continue to deny that they plan to sell out to the Newhouse empire. However, the rumor persists that that is the business strategy of the Newhouse empire in their disputes elsewhere in the Nation, as they have worked to the end of merging, gobbling up, and buying out newspapers which have found themselves in a weakened economic position.

It is interesting to note that it is the Oregonian, owned by the Newhouse empire, which has the strike insurance, which involves one of the very controversial issues which stirred up so much bitter resentment in my State, because more and more people are beginning to recognize the union "busting" purpose of the so-called strike insurance policy. I shall come to that subject later.

I point out that the people of my State have not had access to a full discussion of the pros and cons of this controversy, because they have no newspaper of general circulation to go to, other than the two struck newspapers. The publishers are putting out a joint newspaper. We can take judicial notice of the fact that we have only to read the issues of that newspaper to see that we obtain, from the accounts of the strike in the newspaper of the publishers of the struck plant, a biased and slanted account. Therefore, to a great extent, the people of my State have had to rely upon the views expressed on the pages of the struck newspaper.

An outstanding religious leader of Portland, Dr. Richard M. Steiner, of Portland's First Unitarian Church, stated it very well when he said that, in his opinion, to a large degree, the public has had to rely "upon rumors and upon the biased statements printed by the party that has control of the main avenue of information."

Later I shall ask consent to place in the RECORD some statements which have been published by other religious leaders in my State, who likewise have deplored the fact that the people of my State have not had access to the newspaper media of information which would guarantee to them unbiased accounts of the issues involved in the strike.

It should be stressed again and again that those who are on strike and those who are observing the picket lines at the Oregonian and the Journal are only asking that the traditional practices of collective bargaining be followed by the newspapers.

The empty words of the Oregonian and the Journal fail to fill the void caused by their unwillingness to cooperate with anyone in the interest of bringing this dispute to a conclusion. They have declined to meet with the Governor of Oregon. They have declined the offer of assistance by Oregon's clergy. In my judgment they have failed to use reasonable efforts at the bargaining table to bring about a fair settlement with their employees.

As I said in my brief telecast speech, which I have already read into the RECORD, Governor Hatfield, of my State, and Senator NEUBERGER, my colleague in the Senate, some weeks ago made the recommendation publicly that the parties to the dispute ought to agree to have a factfinding board appointed and have that board or the parties make a report of the facts to the people of Oregon.

It was a very fair and sensible proposal, but it was the newspapers who rejected it. The unions made clear that they would accept the Hatfield-Neuberger proposal. As Senators will see from the material that I shall insert in the RECORD later, it was the position of the newspapers that they saw no reason for accepting the proposal, because it would only bring the dispute into the arena of politics.

Mr. President, it should be brought into the arena of politics, in the high sense of the term of politics. It was in that sense that Governor Hatfield and Senator NEUBERGER made their suggestion. As I have said earlier tonight, the matter now is imbued and filled with the public interest. When the public interest becomes involved in any economic struggle, the officials of government representing a free people have a duty to step in and make proposals for a settlement of the dispute in a way which will protect the public interest and, by protecting the public interest, be fair to the disputants.

At the time they made their proposal, the proposal of Governor Hatfield and Senator NEUBERGER would have accomplished that purpose. Although I happened to be in South America at the time their proposal was made, had I been in the country I would not have hesitated, if asked, to endorse it.

Mr. President, in this case I believe we have gone beyond the stage at which factfinding alone will suffice. I believe we have reached the stage in this dispute where the public interest is so affected that the public is entitled to have the recommendations of fair, impartial, judicial, and competent men as to how they think the dispute on the merits ought to be settled, in fairness to all three parties to the dispute, namely, the newspaper management, the employees, and the public. It is such a proposal that I recommend today. In my judgment, the record of the case shows that the newspaper publishers have failed to use reasonable efforts at the bargaining table to bring about a fair settlement with their employees.

I have arbitrated many major labor cases in my professional career, over a good many years. Although it is important to make one's final judgment based entirely upon the record of evidence which is before him, it is perfectly obvious, as we read what has happened thus far procedurally on the part of the newspaper owners in this case, that they have not participated in good-faith bargaining. The evidence of the strategy that they have used from session to session convinces me that their desire has not been to bargain collectively with the employees but to put the employees in a position whereby they will be compelled to surrender to the employer's terms and demands. No wonder there has been stirred up among the newspaper workers in Portland the attitude "We will dig in for as long as necessary to protect the precious rights for which labor has sacrificed so much over the years to win for itself."

I wish to say that if the employers in this country decide to adopt the tactics being used by the Newhouse empire in the Portland newspaper strike, the country can get ready for militancy on the part of free men and women in the American labor movement the like of which we have not known for some decades. Free men and women in the American labor movement cannot sacrifice these precious rights which are so deeply imbedded now in the whole collective bargaining fabric of American industrial relations.

That is why I am making a plea for a relaxation of tensions, for a recognition on the part of those in the controversy that we have reached a point now where the rules of reason will have to be applied. If they are going to be applied, we will have to bring in a third party in the form of an impartial board to sit in judgment and recommend to the parties and to the public what would be a commonsense solution, issue-by-issue, of this very difficult controversy.

Of course the attitude and practices of the Newhouse empire in its antiunion drive in Portland is not only bad, but it has created a very sad situation. However, that is not surprising if one takes the time to study the tactics and practices of the Newhouse newspaper chain in other parts of the country prior to the strike in Portland.

After all, what can be expected of newspapers that resort to the unscrupulous 19th century practice of importing hired professional strikebreakers to resolve disputes? This conduct is generally shunned by most employers of our day. We can say with pride that that is the case. Therefore I am particularly disappointed that in the year 1960 we would have a newspaper publisher, the head of a great newspaper chain and a great economic empire, resorting to the tactic of importing strikebreakers, which is a tactic that most people, I believe, thought was rapidly disappearing from the whole scene of industrial disputes in our country.

But there it is, rearing its ugly head in the largest city of my State. I rise on the floor of the Senate to protest it. I rise on the floor of the Senate to plead through this speech with the people of the State of Oregon to make clear that there is no place in Oregon for a return to the strike-busting tactics adopted by antiunion employers in the 1880's, 1890's, and early 1900's, who took the stiff-necked position that they would kill the union rather than bargain with it in good faith and agree to reasonable terms of hours, wages, and conditions of employment.

That these newspapers have warped my words in the past and have presented half truths about me is not too surprising, because that is their political stock in trade. But now they are blasting their employees of many years and at the same time are wrapping a cloak of alleged goodness around hired strike breakers. Their regular employees on strike or observing the picket lines are fighting for what they believe is right and in the best interests of the working people and trade union members of Portland and Oregon in general.

The publishers are simply running true to form. They have fought liberal thought. Now they turn their wrath on their employees who want only the time-honored processes of collective bargaining observed so that their position may be considered by management and a settlement finally reached.

The Portland newspaper monopoly has recently been issuing sanctimonious edi-

torials alleging a breach of contracts by the various typographical unions. But these editorials fail to point out some significant facts.

The Stereotypers' Union contract had terminated before its members went out on strike; the Printers' Union contract had expired on September 15, the Photoengravers' Union members worked for 2 days until the contract expired on November 15, then they respected the picket line.

The Newspaper Guild contract does not have a no-strike clause and nothing in the contract requires the union to go through a picket line; some members of the Newspaper Guild returned to work, others have not.

The Pressmen's Union contract expired December 31, 1959, and prior to that time the international officers of the union ordered the members to fulfill the union's contract with the publishers, thereby demonstrating the international union's responsibility.

By secret ballot local members of the Pressmen's Union voted 108 to 1 to go out on strike and on January 1 took strike action; the Paper Handlers voted 22 to 0 to strike.

The International Typographical Union had no contract, but held 13 meetings with the publishers prior to the time of the strike, without making progress; the stereotypers met with the publishers 18 times prior to the strike without being able to resolve the dispute.

The Portland newspaper monopoly, like all backward-looking employers, relied heavily upon legalisms in dealing labor relations. Employers of this type refuse to recognize the facts of life in these relationships and proceed unrealistically to ignore the fact that no self-respecting member of a union wants to cross the picket line of a sister union when a labor dispute is in progress.

If the strike should succeed, the next logical step, of course, would be the operation of nonunion papers. That is really what the Newhouse newspaper chain is seeking. I am particularly concerned over the fact that the Federal law now on the books does not effectively prohibit the importation of strikebreakers as now practiced by the Oregonian and Journal. At my request the Library of Congress supplied a brief memorandum on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum and the text of the Byrnes Act be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum and act were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 22, 1959.

To: The Honorable WAYNE MORSE.
From: Economics Division.
Subject: The Byrnes Act.

The Byrnes Act prohibits not only the transportation of persons to obstruct or interfere with peaceful picketing but applies also to the transportation of persons with the intent to employ them to obstruct or interfere with the right of employees to organize collectively for bargaining purposes. Because this law has been invoked infrequently, there are no recorded court decisions which would show just how far the law goes in restricting management's right to replace strikers with new employees brought in from other States. (BNA Labor Policy and Practices. Labor Relations, 60: 482.)

TRANSPORTATION OF STRIKEBREAKERS (BYRNES ACT)

(Act of June 24, 1936, 49 Stat. 1899, Public Law 776, ch. 746, 74th Cong., 2d sess., as last amended by act of May 24, 1949, ch. 139, sec. 30, 63 Stat. 94, 18 U.S.C., ch. 57, sec. 1231.)

An act making it a felony to transport in interstate or foreign commerce persons to be employed to obstruct or interfere with the right of peaceful picketing during labor controversies.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whoever willfully transports in interstate or foreign commerce any person who is employed or is to be employed for the purpose of obstructing or interfering by force or threats with (1) peaceful picketing by employees during any labor controversy affecting wages, hours, or conditions of labor, or (2) the exercise by employees of any of the rights of self-organization or collective bargaining; or

Whoever is knowingly transported in or travels in interstate or foreign commerce for any of the purposes enumerated in this section—

Shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

This section shall not apply to common carriers.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it is fair to charge employers with the knowledge of the fact that union men and women by the thousands will always insist upon acting in their individual capacity if there is an attempt made, even by the union itself, to force them across a legitimate picket line. This is a very deep-seated conviction on the part of a union member. It is something which is charged with great emotionalism and deep feeling. There is hardly anything which can raise the blood pressure of a good union man or woman quicker than the suggestion by a brother union member that he has become a scab by crossing a picket line.

My colleagues in the Senate have heard me plead over the years from the floor, as we have discussed labor legislation, about this matter. I have tried to point out that this happens to be one of the facts of life in connection with the union movement. The history of the American labor movement has too many crosses which are revered by union men and women; crosses symbolizing the lives of union men and women who have been willing to sacrifice their lives, in the earlier days of militant struggle, to gain the right to join a union and to insist upon the requirement of having an employer bargain collectively over wages, hours, and conditions of employment. The literature in this field is voluminous.

In 1960, the Newhouse empire is not going to turn back the clock, and the combination of antiunion employers in this country is not going to turn it back, because free men and women in a free society will not allow it.

It is a sad thing that the great State of Oregon, with its wonderful record over the years, of fair labor conditions, high wages, and a high standard of living for our workers, is confronted with this termite attempt on the part of the Newhouse empire to undermine the citadel and temple of freedom represented by free collective bargaining in the State of Oregon.

It will continue to be my plea and my prayer that reason will come to prevail in this economic crisis in my State. Both sides will recognize now that eventually this strike has to be settled; that eventually it will be settled; and that when it is settled, undoubtedly it will be settled, in part, because an aroused and enlightened public opinion makes clear to all concerned in the struggle, and to the officials of government, that a fair settlement must be provided and carried out. If eventually—can we not ask the question again?—why not now? Why let this waste, why let this suffering, why let this ill feeling which is building up and mounting day by day, continue?

To the end of trying to provide a common sense suggestion for a fair way out for all concerned, I offer the suggestion that the deans or members of the faculties of three or five or seven schools of journalism in this country be accepted by the parties to the dispute as a fact-finding board having the authority to make recommendations for the settlement of the strike, with the clear understanding, just as under the Railway Labor Act of 1926, that the recommendations are not to be binding upon the parties. If the suggestion of having this done by the deans of the schools of journalism is objectionable for some reason or is rejected by one or both of the parties for a good reason of which I am not aware, I am not married to that particular personnel arrangement.

What is wrong with asking some recognized, impartial agency or individual to appoint a fact-finding, recommending board? So far as I am concerned, when I was on the War Labor Board and had an opportunity to observe the policies followed by the U.S. Mediation and Conciliation Service in those rare instances in which they appointed arbitrators, they did a remarkably fair job in the selection of impartial men.

I call upon them to do it. I call upon the Governor of the State to do it.

I recognize that judges are rather hesitant to serve on boards of arbitration; they hesitate because they believe that if they were to serve on such boards, then some how or other, in some way or other, they might be looked upon as bringing the strict judicial approach into nonjudicial controversies. However, there are instances in which the parties to such disputes have agreed to have a judicial officer serve on a board to make findings of fact and recommendations; and that possibility should be considered in this instance.

Mr. President, there are available to the parties to this dispute, many sources for the selection of impartial persons to serve on a board to take testimony, study the case, and make findings of fact, recommendations, and a report. I suggest that consideration be given to including on such a board members of schools of journalism, because I believe that such persons know the newspaper industry and are thoroughly familiar with the problems which confront newspaper publishers and workers. It seems

to me that from the standpoint of experience, members of schools of journalism are very well qualified to serve on boards to make such findings of fact, recommendations, and reports.

But certainly there can be no excuse for rejection of my suggestion by either party to the dispute, on the ground that it would be difficult to obtain impartial members. In our free society we have not reached the point where it is impossible to find a procedure which any fair-minded person will regard as a reasonable one for the selection of other fair-minded persons to serve on a board to judge the facts in connection with such a dispute.

It is too bad that the newspaper industry, which is the beneficiary of the precious trust which accompanies the rights under the freedom-of-the-press clause of the Constitution—and they are constitutional rights, not privileges—should betray its trust in the way the Newhouse empire has been doing in connection with its union-breaking campaign in Portland, Oreg.

Mr. President, I believe all Members of the Senate know that if any proposal to infringe upon freedom of the press in the Nation were made, I would be in the forefront of those who would defend and insist upon protecting the right of the newspapers to have full enjoyment of freedom of the press.

But, Mr. President, other freedoms are precious, too. Among them is the right of union members to enjoy free collective bargaining. I need not tell the Senate or the people of Oregon that if there ever came a time when that freedom was infringed upon or was placed under destructive restrictions, we would then begin to lose a large part of our freedoms.

It has often been stated—but the statement still needs to be repeated—that when freedom in any country begins to wane, its wane usually begins with an attack on labor. In any country in which attempts to destroy freedom are made, the first ones are usually attempts to destroy the freedom of the workers.

Mr. President, I do not say there is any danger of a loss of freedom in our Nation as a whole. But I say we must be constantly vigilant and on guard against any attempt, at any time, in any segment of the body politic, to impair the full enjoyment of the rights of free men and women. In my judgment, those rights are being impaired in the Portland newspaper strike.

I believe we now need a procedure which will bring a return to reason in this situation; and for that purpose I have this evening offered my proposal.

Mr. President, I am about to request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, various editorials and articles which bear upon the Portland newspaper strike. I have selected them from the voluminous material with regard to the strike which has come to my office. In selecting them, I have been motivated by a desire to present material on both sides of the controversy.

In this material will be found editorials, from the Oregonian-Journal, in which all sides of the controversy are set forth; also an article which sets forth in full the statements made by the members of a television panel, in the course of a broadcast in Portland, presenting the workers' side of the controversy. In the same article the editors of the Oregonian-Journal have set forth their rebuttal to the contentions made by the panelists on the program.

I believe it important that all Members of the Senate read this material, in order to ascertain the contentions of the parties to the controversy. After Senators complete their reading of this material, I am perfectly willing to rest my case on their judgment of it.

I urge that this material be read by all Senators, not because I shall ask the Senate to intervene in the Portland newspaper strike, but because this material discloses, in connection with the strike, a pattern of activity by some newspaper publishers which, in my judgment, calls for an investigation by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of certain antilabor tactics, policies, and strategies by some newspaper editors.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a number of newspaper articles and editorials which I believe present a fair synopsis of the employer contentions in the Portland newspaper dispute.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal, Nov. 25, 1959]

SO OUR READERS MAY KNOW

Fifty-odd employees of the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal represented by Stereotypers' Union No. 48 commenced a strike against the two newspaper companies at 5 a.m., November 10, 1959. Approximately 850 employees represented by other unions refused to cross the picket line of the Stereotypers' Union. The unions representing the 850 employees, with the sole exception of Multnomah Typographical Union No. 58, had valid existing contracts with the newspaper companies when the strike commenced. Not a single contract with the newspaper companies held by any union gave the union or the employees it represented the right to refuse to cross the stereotypers' picket line or the right to refuse to perform the work for which they had been employed. In every case the sanctity of contract was ignored. The employees and their unions flouted their contracts and violated their terms.

To avoid a strike the companies during the week preceding the strike in the presence of Federal Mediator Elmer Williams:

1. Offered to let an impartial arbitrator establish the number of men to be employed on new machinery during the life of the contract if the union raised a grievance over the number of men assigned to work on the machine by management. This offer was rejected by Stereotypers' Union No. 48 and by its international union.

2. Offered to submit all matters of difference over the terms of a new contract to final and binding impartial arbitration. This offer was rejected by Stereotypers' Union No. 48 and its international union.

3. Invited, in fact especially requested, the president of the international union to come to Portland and negotiate with the companies after he and his executive board had told the local union they could not agree to avoid a strike by arbitrating the terms of a new contract.

This request made upon the International Stereotyper Union President James Sampson through the local union was rejected and Stereotypers Union No. 48 continued to insist that (a) four men be employed on a one-man machine, (b) foremen must be union members, and (c) the companies recognize their right of substitution, even though it meant payment of time and one-half for a full shift to a replacement employee.

When the companies on November 9, 1959, received word that the stereotypers would commence a strike on November 10, 1959, at 5 a.m. they—

1. Through department heads and supervisors instructed all employees to report for work as usual at their regular starting times on November 10, 1959, even though they might have to cross a picket line.

2. Through proper union officials of each group of employees requested that the employees be told by their union they should honor their union's contract with the companies and report for work as usual even though they might have to cross a picket line.

When the pickets went on at 5 a.m. on November 10, 1959:

1. Employees represented by the Portland Newspaper Guild who ordinarily commence work at 5 a.m. at the Oregon Journal refused to cross the picket line.

2. As time went by employees of the Journal represented by the Typographical Union, Pressmen's Union, Mailers Union, Machinists Union, and Paper Handlers Union also refused to cross the picket line.

3. Employees represented by these same unions scheduled to report later in the morning at the Oregonian also refused to cross the picket line.

4. All entrances at the Journal were open to employees who wished to report for work until 12 noon on November 10, 1959. After that hour, only the main entrance remained open.

5. All regular entrances and employee entrances remained open at the Oregonian throughout the day November 10, 1959.

At mid-morning November 10, 1959, the managements of the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal, recognizing that production necessity would permit operation in only one plant, agreed to produce a joint paper in the Oregonian plant using supervisory personnel and loyal employees of the advertising and circulation departments of both papers who agreed to help with the production effort. Approximately 750 loyal employees remain at work with the two newspapers.

At about 2 p.m. on November 10, 1959, the managements of the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal agreed to continue temporarily a joint publication in the Oregonian plant until such a time as production in their separate plants could be effectively resumed.

To carry out this agreement, immediate steps were taken to make individual offers of full-time permanent employment with the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal as separate newspapers to trained production personnel. This offer was made throughout the United States. The response to the offer has been and continues to be heavy.

Offers of permanent employment to perforator operator trainees and other mechanical trainees have been made and continue to be made in the help wanted classified columns of the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal.

Joint production will be continued until separate production by the Journal can be effectively resumed in the Journal plant.

Our readers must know that—

1. The stereotypers struck despite means of peaceful settlement offered by the companies.

2. Employees represented by other unions refused to cross stereotypers' picket lines even though they were requested and instructed to report to work by the companies.

3. Union and employees alike flouted contracts and made mockery of contracts negotiated in good faith through collective bargaining.

4. The Journal has joined hands with the Oregonian as a production necessity. It is an independent home-owned corporation and intends to return to separate production in the Journal plant when the production problems for the opera'ion of the two plants have been solved.

SO OUR READERS MAY KNOW—No. 2

As the Portland newspaper strike enters its third week, union propagandists are redoubling their efforts to confuse the public and compound the difficulties of settlement. This fanatical campaign of self-justification is being conducted not only on behalf of the stereotypers who struck the papers in the face of the publishers' offer to arbitrate. It is being conducted also in defense of those other unions whose members rushed into the streets—and into the picket lines—most in flagrant violation of their contracts, all in complete disregard of the publishers' offer of continued work for those who would stay on the job and honor their contracts or would bargain for new contracts in the normal manner.

The stereotypers are represented in this campaign by the unions as having been pushed into the strike by a management demand to dictate the manning of a new machine. The truth is that management was willing to negotiate and even arbitrate the number of men to be employed on the MAN plate caster after the machine had been given a fair trial in production.

It was the Stereotypers Union that insisted that its antiquated make-work rules should govern the manning of the machine for an indefinite period. The manufacturer has stated that the new machine calls for only one man. The union's offer to "negotiate after the machine was installed" meant, simply, that the companies would be required to operate the machine with four men. This represented no savings at all over manning on present machines. Worse than mere featherbedding, this union position was tantamount to a demand that the publishers agree not to install the new machine, since its only value is as a labor-saving device. The local union's claim that the companies have rejected the traditional method for determining the number of men to be employed on stereotyping equipment, namely through negotiation between the American Newspaper Publishers Association and the International Stereotypers' Union is based on a false premise. George N. Dale, for 17 years head of the ANPA labor office in Chicago, categorically denies that any such negotiations have ever taken place or are now contemplated between the employers' national trade association and the international union.

But the manning of the MAN machine was only 1 issue, not 1 out of 3 but 1 out of 20 or more issues, which the union left unbargained or half bargained on the table when its members hurried out to call the strike.

The unlimited right of lay-off, virtually unknown outside the printing trades and not permitted in many printing trades contracts, had been discussed and an impasse had been reached because of the union's refusal to consider any practical solution to the companies' problem of resultant overtime. The union's promise of a straight-time substitute for a regular employee laying off for his own convenience was an empty gesture. It could only result, in most cases, in the companies incurring overtime at the end of the week when the companies needed extra help at straight-time rates.

The publishers and the union bargained and deadlocked over a contract requirement, believed by the companies to be illegal under recent decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, under which the foreman must become a member of the union and take an oath to enforce certain unlawful closed-shop rules laid down by the international. The companies did not say that foremen might not voluntarily join the union.

Hardly considered at the end of the 18 bargaining sessions were the usual union demands on wages, hours, and fringe benefits. The companies had made it clear, however, both to the stereotypers and to the typographical union, that they had no objection to, and in fact favored, a health and welfare program or other union elected fringes. For 4 years, the companies have proposed that the union take health and welfare contributions out of their negotiated wage-cost package, thereby giving themselves a tax advantage. Most unions rejected this. The stereotypers and typographers specifically demanded and obtained a cash settlement instead. The publishers renewed their proposal this year.

Why, then, did the strike occur November 10? The conclusion is inescapable that the stereotypers, who boasted across the bargaining table that they had obtained "100 percent support" from the other unions, contracts or no contracts, hoped, intended, and confidently expected to shut down the two Portland newspapers at the onset of the pre-Christmas advertising and shopping season so that they might force their demands upon a prostrate Oregonian and Oregon Journal—economic consequences to the community notwithstanding.

So the stereotypers did strike in accordance with their timetable, when it would hurt the newspapers the most, and the other unions went out with the stereotypers, most in cynic disregard for their contract commitments. But part of the plan failed. The Oregonian and the Oregon Journal did not capitulate or lie down and die as metropolitan newspapers are expected to do when confronted with a plantwide strike.

These two competing newspapers joined forces temporarily to publish jointly under a combined masthead and thus to maintain service as best they could to readers and advertisers in Portland and the Pacific Northwest. That service is improving and will continue to improve no matter how long the strike lasts. The Journal will resume publication in its own plant when the production problems for a two-plant operation are solved.

Meanwhile—back at the bargaining table—the negotiators will try to unscramble the omelet of old issues and new problems raised by the strike itself. With all the broken contracts lying around, the question will arise how any agreement can be signed with these unions and be worth the paper it is written on. In fact, this basic question of union integrity and the sanctity of contracts now becomes the major problem—a problem which goes to the very foundation of the collective bargaining relationship.

In the stereotypers' strike and the walkout of the unions, Humpty-Dumpty had a great fall. It remains to be seen whether Humpty-Dumpty can be put back together again.

INTERUNION'S BLUEPRINT FOR ACTION

The following is a complete text of a TV program broadcast over KGW–TV on Friday night, December 11:

"ANNOUNCER. Views expressed on the following program are not necessarily those of KGW–TV or the Pioneer Broadcasting Co. The Portland interunion strike committee presents 'A Blueprint for Action,' another report to the people bringing you the big story of the Portland newspaper strike. Here now is James T. Marr, executive secretary of the Oregon AFL–CIO.

"Mr. MARR. Tonight the talk on interunion newspaper strike committee presents 'A Blueprint for Action.' In our prior programs we have given a factual picture of the demands of management and the conciliatory attitude of the unions involved. We have presented a panel of responsible business, professional, and trade union representatives who have spoken in favor of the position taken by the unions. Last week we told the story of the strike directly from the mouths of those most closely involved in the strike-lockout—the strikers and their families—of those who are suffering not only economic hardship but also the anguish brought about by threatening telephone calls demanding that they give up their union activity or else. And we do not accuse the newspaper managements for being responsible for the threatening phone calls. We should not be fooled for 1 minute. The Portland public is being shortchanged by the struck newspapers. For the hybrid newspaper that is being published behind curtained windows is charging double rates for classified advertising for a reduced circulation. The same newspaper, representing itself to be a joint venture publication incorporating both the Oregonian and the Journal, is being written by only a small fraction of the number of the normal news staff. A hundred and forty newsmen and photographers, members of the Portland Newspaper Guild, are respecting the picket line. The working press is not working. Management is filling the news columns with wire-service reports and an occasional local story. The unions do not believe that newspaper management has bargained in good faith and feel that newspaper management has failed to keep faith with the reading public by endeavoring to publish some kind of a paper in order to try to maintain their display advertising accounts, while at the same time they are probably receiving substantial strike insurance. It is interesting to note that the largest local advertising in the struck newspaper is the largest non-union department store in Portland. A blueprint for action must be based on fact. To clearly determine the facts we have asked Keith Burns, deputy district attorney for Multnomah County, to examine representatives of the striking Stereotypers Union and members of the other unions involved in this dispute. Mr. Burns.

"KEITH BURNS. There are many questions—burning questions—in the minds of the public regarding the current newspaper strike. As we are not in any way connected with the strike or the unions involved, I hope that I will be able to ask of those present some of the very questions that you as members of the public may have in mind. Mr. Cotner, it is my understanding that you are a member of the scale or negotiating committee of Stereotypers' Local 48, and that you have been present during the meetings of your union with the management of Portland's daily newspaper. Tell me, Mr. Cotner, what in your judgment, is responsible for the failure of management and the union to get together on the matter of this new machine that has become such an issue in this strike?

"TED COTNER. Mr. Burns, throughout the more than 20 bargaining sessions that we've had with management, the question of the number of men required to operate this machine and the method of which their manning will be determined has been a continuing stumbling block. Our union has made many concessions to management in respect to our position in regarding this machine. Our present position, which seems reasonable to me and which I feel certain the public will feel is reasonable, is simply this: First of all, this MAN machine, which is manufactured in Germany, is not installed in the Oregonian. Actually, the management of the Oregonian has only stated that they intend to buy such a machine sometime in the future. Now, it is my understanding that if the company laid the cash

on the line tomorrow, it would be at least a year before this machine could be delivered. However, during the negotiations and in the interest of settling this strike, the union has offered to operate the machine with the X number of men—in other words, the number found to be necessary to operate the machine for the life of any contract arrived through these current negotiations without any work stoppage or strike at the time the new machine is introduced. We ask that the union, in conjunction with management, shall determine the number of men required to operate the machine safely and to the best interests of the company in terms of production. The company has said "No" to this and insists that the manning of this machine be left entirely up to its foreman as concerning the number of employees to operate it safely.

"KEITH BURNS. Briefly, then, you have said that the union will man the machine when and if it is installed with X number of men. You ask that management and the union jointly determine the number of stereotypers necessary to do the job safely and quickly.

"Mr. COTNER. Yes; that is our position.

"Mr. BURNS. And management has said "No" to this—that it wants the right to determine the number of men required to operate the machine.

"Also with us this evening is Perry Badgley, international representative of the Stereotypers Union. Mr. Badgley has also been present at some of the more recent negotiating sessions. Mr. Badgley, what are your impressions of negotiations to date?

"PERRY BADGLEY. Well, Mr. Burns, I can say, without any hesitation, that during the 15 years that I have been active in negotiations in behalf of our international union, I have never run into a situation of the nature to be found here in Portland. Time and time again during these negotiations sessions the union has been willing to make concessions to management. Each time concessions are made, which we feel should result in bringing the parties closer together, management still will not agree with our proposal which we feel to be reasonable. Never have we gotten down to the bedrock consideration of the union's proposals. It is obvious to me that the problems that have been presented by management are not the real problems at all. They serve only as a guide to hide the real intent and purpose of the strike. To me the most damning proposal to come out of the negotiations are the demand of management that they want us to take into our union the imported strikebreakers who are now operating the machines that our members, many of whom are long-time residents of Portland, operated before the strike Management now asks that these imported strikebreakers be given priority of employment over those regular employees who were forced out on strike by what we believe to be unreasonable demands of management. The MAN machine, the foreman clause, and that of the right of substitution have been used by management as a smokescreen issue behind which they can hide their intent to establish a nonunion operation for their publications. This position taken by the company that strikebreakers be given job priority over their other employees now on strike should serve as a cue to the minds of the public when they consider who is right and who is wrong in this current strike situation. For if its demand for the vicious undercutting of their own employees is indicative of the frame of mind of newspaper management, this serves only to show them in their true light.

"Mr. BURNS. Mr. Cotner, Mr. Badgley has mentioned the foreman clause issue. Can you tell us briefly what is involved in this disputed issue?

"Mr. COTNER. To make what has been a rather long story throughout these negotiations somewhat shorter, I will tell you of the exact position of the stereotype union on this issue and this position again has been arrived at on the part of the union as a matter of a concession to the demands of management in the interest of bringing this strike to a conclusion. We ask, simply, that the matter of whether or not a foreman be a member of the union be left entirely up to the individual foreman. This is all we are asking. To this management says "No." They have contended that it is illegal for foremen to belong to the union. We contend that it is legal. In recent weeks the Federal circuit court of appeals has upheld our convictions.

"Mr. BURNS. Mr. Cotner, why has this matter become an issue? Why do you feel that a foreman should have a right to belong to the union?

"Mr. COTNER. Well first of all, it is important to understand that a foreman in our trade is a working foreman. He works right along with the journeymen on the job. These foremen have come up through the ranks, first as an apprentice, then as a journeyman, later as an assistant foreman and then the foreman, all of which, incidentally, are covered by the contract. Union membership in a craft union is a valuable possession of the member. He has worked at the trade for years to become proficient in his job and become a recognized journeyman. We ask only that the right of self-determination be left up to the individual when he becomes a foreman. We ask only that he be given the right to continue his association and membership in an organization representing his trade if this be his choice.

"Mr. BURNS. Mr. Badgley, when you spoke before you mentioned another issue, the right of substitution. Can you explain briefly what is the area of disagreement in this matter?

"Mr. BADGLEY. Well, the matter of the right of substitution can be stated very simply. The union asks that, if it is necessary for a stereotyper to take time off from his job to attend to personal business, that the union be given the right to furnish in his place a fully qualified stereotyper who will work at the straight-time rate. Management states that such substitutions result in occasion where a time-and-a-half rate must be hired. They also demand that an employee must go to his foreman and his right to time off will be determined completely on the say-so of the foreman. We contend that if a man, for instance, wants to take time off because of a death in his family, and the union is willing to supply a qualified journeyman stereotyper in his place at the straight-time rate, that he should be entitled to do so without having to give an accounting to his foreman exactly why it is he needs the time to attend to his personal business. We feel that if a substitute can be supplied the company at no additional expense to the company, that the matter of the right of substitution fails to stand up as an issue to be opposed by management in this strike situation.

"Mr. BURNS. It seems to me that you have both answered the questions fairly regarding where the union stands on this issue. I know by your comment, and it is apparent from your tone of voice, that it is your feeling that the union has reached the end of the road in terms of concessions to newspaper management as regards the matters at issue. As a local union representative, Mr. Cotner, can you tell me how your membership now feels about this matter?

"Mr. COTNER. My union is 100 percent behind their negotiating committee and their officers. The apparent hope on the part of newspaper management that our members will pick up and drift away is totally unrealistic. We are prepared to wait out the time that it requires the Oregonian and Journal to learn that it is just too expensive to continue operations with hired outside strikebreakers, and all the costs connected with maintaining this type of struck operation. We appreciate the tremendous public support that has been given our cause in terms of newspaper cancellations on the part of the thousands of individuals. Our participation in this and the television programs that have preceded it, I feel, have been crystal clear evidence of our complete willingness to let the public know what has led to the strike, what the current strike developments are and, still more important, that we are going to stand our ground against imported strikebreakers, telephone threats—and, again we do not accuse management of these threats—and our belief that management has failed to bargain in good faith, and management's failure even to meet with the Governor of Oregon to discuss the settlement of this dispute. We are determined that when this strike is settled the Portland daily newspapers will continue to be manned by union employees paid a fair living wage and contributing their part to the social and civic betterment of our community. We ask only that the public be aware of the fact, and being aware of the fact, join us in our fight against those concepts of newspaper management that have resulted in the importation of strikebreakers and the continuance of management's attitude alien to the long-established practice of bargaining collectively with their employees.

"Mr. BURNS. It is my understanding that the reporters and photographers regularly employed by Portland's two daily newspapers are respecting the stereotypers' picket line. We have with us this evening Mr. Charles Dale, international representative of the Newspaper Guild who is in Portland representing the Newspaper Guild during the current stereotypers' strike. Mr. Dale, the guild members are the regular news gatherers for the Oregonian and the Journal and perhaps those who by virtue of their work are close to the pulse beat of our community. How do they feel about this strike?

"CHARLES DALE. Well, on the eve of the Portland stereotypers' strike, the Portland Newspaper Guild met and for over 2 hours debated all aspects of the crisis. Then in secret ballot they voted overwhelmingly to honor the stereotyper picket line. The decision came despite the fact that the guild has a contract in existence with both dailies, a contract that will not expire until next June. The guild's action was not taken lightly. Since the strike began, guild members have been honoring the picket line as a matter of survival, for this strike did not come as any great surprise. Evidence is shown that the Portland newspaper unions would have been facing a strike sooner or later. It was nearly the guild in October, stereotypers last month and this, it could have been the printers or the mailers or the pressmen or perhaps the guild next June. I do not believe this strike could have been avoided, even if the union had wanted to concede all of the conditions demanded by the publishers, even if the unions had been willing to give up all of the traditional contract clauses. I believe this.

"Mr. BURNS. This seem to me like a statement that could be enlarged upon. Exactly why do you feel that the strike could not have been avoided?

"Mr. DALE. Well it appears to me there has been a great deal of a high degree of planning for the strike by management prior to the time the strike actually began. Witness the influx of professional strikebreakers within hours after the stereotypers' picket line first went up in the early morning hours of November 10. That very afternoon a paper came out, a makeshift product to be sure, but a paper just the same. Next day and in the days that followed the quality of the paper improved as more and more

strikebreakers arrived from all over the country. By this time last week, guild members, reporters, and editors had uncovered upward of 70 strikebreakers. If any have left recently is unknown. But certainly more are arriving all the time. This, despite the resentment Portland residents feel against such tactics, despite the feeling that the clock in labor-management relations has been turned back decades by the actions of the two daily newspapers. Strikebreakers are new in the Northwest, but professional strikebreakers are not new to the American Newspaper Guild. They are even more familiar to the International Typographical Union, the pressmen, the stereotypers, and the mailers, for repeatedly in the East and in the South we have found ourselves faced with the same problem, professional strikebreakers brought in not only to run the paper after the strike begins but even before negotiations have deadlocked. They are brought in and kept as standbys in hotel rooms and serve as a constant threat to the negotiating union. They are a continual menace to collective bargaining in good faith. You know it is sometimes very difficult to convince people of this fact—strikebreakers are a menace to the living standards of the entire community. Let them break down the unions in the newspaper business. Let them make it possible for the two publishers to operate without union contracts and before long the temptation of low wage rates, of no contracts, will be too great for even some of the best employers, and in will come more strikebreakers and down will go the living standards. Here in Portland the guild has collected evidence of a parade of the hardest and most experienced strikebreakers. We have the McCoy leadership. Leo McCoy, of Oklahoma City or Galveston, Tex. He is a veteran of strikebreaking operations, Las Vegas, Kennewick, Oklahoma City, Galveston, and Ypsilanti, Mich., are among his shadowy assignments. Then there is L. B. Maxwell, born December 22, 1927, a veteran of the Monroe, La., strike, a member of the notorious strikebreaking crew of Bloor Schleppey and Shirley Klein. A lack of time prohibits me giving details of other strikebreakers known to be working on the two struck dailies. Of course, they are being ably assisted by local residents who have been attracted to the papers by promises of high hourly rates, incentive bonuses, and so forth. Hardened strikebreakers, schooled in the art of killing unions and stealing jobs, are no longer a source of surprise to international union employees. We have become accustomed to their faces. One thing that never fails to surprise us, however, is the reaction of the local people who, seeing the possibility of a fast buck by scabbing reach out and grab it. That newspapers, which in most communities stand as a symbol of freedom and justice, should stoop to the tactics now being practiced by the Oregonian and the Journal, is in my judgment, deplorable. Many members of the general public have made their feelings known by refusing to accept into their homes newspapers which are responsible for bringing into Portland such an undesirable element as professional strikebreakers.

"Mr. BURNS. Thank you, Mr. Dale. Now I would like to ask Mr. Chet Rookledge, a lifelong printer, who I understand has watched the growth and development of free collective bargaining over a period of 40 years how he feels the current strike situation compares with labor-management disputes in the newspaper field in past years. Mr. Rookledge, how do you feel about the position taken by management in the current strike?

"CHET ROOKLEDGE. Before I get into the direct question of the strike, Keith, I feel it is important to point out that through the years past, by means of good faith collective bargaining, certain rights have accrued to the union worker. I have been a union worker at my trade of printer since 1916. I am proud of my craft. It is an old and established one. Our international membership is over 100,000. We were one of the six founders of the American Federation of Labor. As for myself I will be 63 years of age this coming January. My race is nearly run. But for the younger members of my union, and all other organized working people in this community of ours the struggle now going on between newspaper management on one hand and the union employees on the other has an ugly, disturbing undertone in the avowed intent of management to publish by the use of imported strikebreakers. The pattern to this person seems clear. Break one link of solidarity and you break all. Nonunionize a major industry in an economic area and soon it spreads throughout the web of all industry, soon very soon, you have lowered living standards and a breakdown of the civic health of the community follows. Witness the nonunion Southern States. The city of Portland has had its labor disputes, some short, some long. In my industry, newspaper publishing, this is the first time locally that avowed imported strikebreakers have been used by the management to continue their operations when faced with a labor dispute. We ask the question. Why? Is this the Portland that you and I know? The responsibility for a condition like this must be laid at the door of a complete breakdown in bargaining by management. This is not the Portland way. We all know the effects of a malignant growth upon human body. By surgery we cut it out. In the case of the newspaper strike, there has been imposed by management a malignant growth of nonunionism on the economic body of this area. How do we rectify and correct this malignancy? We cut this growth out by the economic reprisal of permanently stopping our subscriptions to these struck newspapers and by asking our friends and business associates not to advertise in this combined attempt at a metropolitan newspaper that is being published at the Oregonian plant by nonunion personnel. There are other good newspapers in the immediate area to which you can subscribe. They are all published by union craftsmen, under union contracts, arrived at in good faith bargaining, and include the Vancouver Columbian, the Oregon City Enterprise, the Oregon Labor Press, and Monroe Sweetland's weekly Milwaukie Review. My friends, this is the blueprint. By firm positive action on the part of the citizens of this area as individuals and collectively, this malignancy on the economic body of the area can be removed. I wish to point out that this TV program has provided a means to the Portland interunion strike committee to bring to you the honest and confirmed facts concerning the threats to the wives and children, as well as the workers, on strike at Portland's two daily newspapers. It is important to note in this connection that were imported strikebreakers being used in any other labor dispute in this area, other than by the newspapers themselves, these acts of intimidation and violence would be front-page news.

"Mr. BURNS. It would appear to me that the union representatives here this evening have answered my questions concerning the basic issues involved in the current strike situation fully and completely. I can only wonder if the management of Portland's two daily newspapers would have submitted to the same examination. Here now to summarize this evening's program and to present the union's blueprint for action is James T. Marr, executive secretary of the Oregon AFL–CIO.

"Mr. MARR. You have heard representatives of the Stereotypers' Union now on strike tell of their many concessions to management during the course of their negotiations. You have heard them state their feelings of utter frustration when after over 20 meetings with management each forward step taken by the union is blocked by new and in the end unreasonable demands made on the part of the newspapers. The final insult by management is the demand that the imported strikebreakers be given priority over the employees now on strike. Charles Dale, the international representative of the Newspaper Guild, has presented detailed and factual information concerning the use of strikebreakers on the part of the struck publications. These professional strikebreakers are alien to Oregon, both in terms of their regular residence and their philosophy. That the owners and management of Portland's two daily newspapers should resort to such tactics is not to be condoned by the public. The public unquestionably feels that the newspapers have a moral public responsibility just as they have to their own employees. Newspapers traditionally pride themselves on complete and factual reporting and independent editorial policy. It is by these means that they are known to be one of the foremost architects of public opinion. Let us hope and pray that it is not their desire to mold a public in their own image today.

"Why, we ask, when news concerns the newspapers, does it cease to be news. Why do we have to depend upon television, radio, and our own labor press to bring the facts concerning the strike to the people of Portland?

"We know that it has not only been since the strike that the Oregonian has drawn a paper curtain over its pressroom windows to hide out what goes on inside from public view. Is it possible that they feel that, by drawing a news curtain over their bargaining methods and their importation of strikebreakers, those issues which could be damaging to the newspapers in the eyes of the public will simply disappear.

"Certainly, as far as their coverage of the strike is concerned, it is safe to say that the joint-venture newspaper being published by nonunion employees is presenting the public with only half of the news.

"Nor can it be said that they have done any better editorially. Time and time again on these telecasts, the question of strike insurance being held by one or both publications has been raised. At no time to date has the hybrid newspaper in either of its editorial columns denied this fact. Could it be that this is an instance where silence is literally golden? Contrary to the position taken by the struck newspapers, the unions involved have taken you behind the scenes in the Portland newspaper strike. They have purchased this television program and three others in order to present the facts concerning the current status of negotiations. They have presented a member of the clergy, a past president of the Portland League of Women Voters, and a businessman on one of their programs to assess the public's point of view toward the strike. The unions have hired neither a private police force nor the likes of strikebreakers to maintain their position. They have only suggested, if you believe the position of the newspapers to be wrong, that you cancel your subscriptions. A blueprint for action on behalf of the public in support of their friends and neighbors who are on strike at the Journal and the Oregonian can only be drawn in the area of economic reprisal. It must be remembered that to buy the paper is to also buy the principles currently being sponsored by the paper. The nickels, dimes, and dollars spent on subscriptions go into the pockets of imported strikebreakers. By the same token, to advertise in the struck publication also provides aid and comfort to an enterprise that has brought in not only alien employees but alien ideas into the country."

AND THE TRUTH

In adjacent columns is the complete text of a television program, "A Blueprint for Action," broadcast over KGW–TV Friday night under sponsorship of a Portland interunion strike committee. It is not normal procedure for Portland newspapers to publish complete texts of TV programs, not even when the broadcasts are by persons as important as the President of the United States.

However, in view of the wide interest in the Portland newspaper strike, in view of the seriousness and the falsity of many of the charges contained in the broadcast, and in view of the fact that, after three such programs, the Portland's interunion strike committee has finally touched upon some of the issues, the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal make this exception.

What are the false ideas the strike committee is seeking to sell the public? Here they are, and here are the facts:

HOW ABOUT THE STRIKEBREAKERS

The broadcast repeatedly referred to imported strikebreakers, implying the Journal and the Oregonian are being printed by outside people of inferior moral or social status.

The truth is that the vast majority of those engaged in publishing the joint newspaper are Oregon citizens of long standing. All are good people, most of them married, a large percentage owning their own homes and paying Oregon taxes.

In connection with so-called strikebreakers, Charles Dale, an international representative of the Newspaper Guild, charged a high degree of planning for the strike by management prior to the time the strike actually began.

The truth is there was no such planning. Pickets appeared before the doors of the struck plants at 5 a.m. on November 10. It was not until 2 p.m. that afternoon that the first telephone call for outside assistance was made.

Dale further charged that they are being ably assisted by local residents who have been attracted to the papers by promises of high hourly rates, incentive bonuses, and so forth.

The truth is that local residents have been attracted in large numbers by the very high pay rates of those who abandoned their jobs and by nothing more—no incentive bonuses and no "and so forth." In one department alone, 100 percent of the employees who walked off their jobs have been replaced—and 100 percent by local residents. Many others are being hired in other departments to meet production requirements, most of them Oregon citizens.

Dale expressed outrage that the Portland papers "should stoop to the tactics now being practiced by the Oregonian and The Journal." He said it is, in his judgment, "deplorable."

What are these deplorable tactics? Simply the continuance of operation, a decision on the part of management to preserve its business and to continue to serve its readers, its advertisers, and the community as a whole. The alternative: shut down the plants. Thus the newspapers had two choices—operate, or cut off from employment 750 loyal employees and 400 loyal independent contractors who were eager to continue work. Is it really "deplorable" not to throw 1,150 loyal people out of work merely to improve the bargaining position of a group of about 50 other workers?

Such a shutdown occurred when another local of this same Stereotypers Union struck the San Jose newspaper earlier this year. It was shut down for more than 100 days—and scores of employees were thrown out of work. The Portland papers chose to operate.

HOW ABOUT UNION CONCESSIONS?

Repeatedly throughout the program, union spokesmen talked about "concessions" the stereotypers made to management. But what were the concessions? They weren't spelled out. Why? Because the fact is there were no concessions. None. Here are some of the issues where concessions might have been made but were not:

Foreman: Ted Cotner of the stereotypers' negotiating committee said: "We ask simply that the matter of whether or not a foreman be a member of the union be left entirely up to the individual foreman"

This is a bald untruth. The publisher's original proposal provided—and still provides—that the matter of the foreman becoming or not becoming a member of the union be left to the decision of the foreman. The real issue is the union's insistence—illegally—that the foreman be compelled to join the union.

Substitution: The union considers it unholy that "an employee must go to his foreman and his right to time off will be determined completely on the say-so of the foreman."

The truth is there is no inherent right to take time off at will. Stereotypers talk about replacing themselves whenever they want time off by straight time workers, but what they fail to add is that this reduces the labor pool so that labor shifts must be filled by time and a half workers. During the deer season—a time of greatest need because of pre-Christmas work volume—men have laid of in droves, forcing the newspapers to pay for their hunting pleasures at time and a half.

The MAN machine: When the strike started, the stereotypers were saying it took four men to man this machine. In the broadcast, they said it takes X number of men, the X to be determined jointly.

Obviously, this would leave the union with the veto power still to insist upon four men when the time comes for the machine to be operated. Actually, the machine was designed to be operated by only one man. Management's choice: retain the power of determining the number of men or turn that power over to the union in the form of a veto.

WHAT'S THIS ABOUT A LOCKOUT?

There has been much talk on the part of the printers and mailers, both members of the International Typographical Union, of their having been locked out.

This is the most utter nonsense to evolve out of the whole strike situation. The truth is that both printers and the mailers, as well as all other unions (many of whom have violated their word and their contracts) were invited to continue working and, indeed, were directed by their supervisors to do so. The mailers had a valid, existing contract, but refused to honor it and continue to work. Is this a lockout?

Consider, too, this inconsistency. In Portland, the printers and mailers charge they have been locked out because they refuse, of their own volition, to cross a picket line. At the same time, in New York City, another local of this same mailers union has pressed to arbitration a demand that New York newspapers pay mailers wages during the strike prior to last Christmas. Why? Because the paper did not publish. The New York mailers' claim is that the newspapers failed to live up to their contract because they did not operate during the strike; although they—the mailers—were ready then to cross the picket line to work.

MUCH ADO ABOUT STRIKE INSURANCE

James T. Marr, executive secretary of the Oregon AFL–CIO, again brought up "the question of strike insurance being held by one or both publication."

What is this evil thing called strike insurance? Well, the unions certainly should know. Their strike insurance, called defense funds, runs into millions of dollars. These millions, collected on a national basis from as many as 100,000 members or more—as in the case of the printers, for instance—can be focused with tremendous economic force upon the papers in a single community.

In the small city of Pasco, Wash., for example, the International Typographical Union poured in more than $1,178,000 to underwrite the losses of the Columbia Basin News, a paper born as a daily after the strike began, to enter into competition with the struck paper. This was in addition to untold thousands of dollars paid in strike benefits for 9 years, all in an economic war against the Tri-City Herald, which the union had struck.

SOME MISCELLANEOUS UNION LOOSE TALK

Perry Badgley: "To me the most damning proposal to come out of the negotiations are the demand of management was [sic] that they want us to take into our union the imported strikebreakers who are now operating the machines that our members, many of whom are longtime residents of Portland, operated before the strike. Management now asks that these imported strikebreakers be given priority of employment over those regular employees who were forced out on strike by what we believe to be unreasonable demands of management."

The facts: There has been no proposal by management that the union take into its membership anyone it has employed since the beginning of the strike. The people who have been employed have been employed permanently to replace the individuals on strike or individuals who abandoned their jobs. The truth is that management has insisted that no one employed since the strike began shall be forced to join any union.

AND SOME MORE MISCELLANY

James T. Marr referred in the TV program to a "paper curtain" drawn over the "Oregonian's pressroom windows to hide out what goes on inside from public view."

These are, in fact, not paper curtains, but sturdy plywood shields to protect the pressrooms from possible sabotage of the kind that has occurred elsewhere in newspaper strikes.

Charles Dale brazenly confessed that guild members walked off their jobs by official union vote, breaching a contract which would have been in effect until June of 1960. His exact words: "The decision came despite the fact that the guild has a contract in existence with both dailies, a contract that will not expire until next June."

James T. Marr again: "The unions have hired neither a private police force or the likes of strikebreakers to maintain their position."

The facts: The only instance of violence to occur since the beginning of the strike was a physical attack by three union members upon a loyal Journal worker. Two of these union members were found guilty in court and were subjected to fines. The third still is being sought under a John Doe warrant.

[From the Oregonian-Journal, Jan. 8, 1960]

PAPERS RAP ULTIMATUM OF STRIKERS

High officials of international newspaper unions Thursday, at conclusion of summit meetings in Portland, issued a statement in which they charged that "the publishers have chosen" to make the Portland newspaper strike "an all-out-fight" and said: "We must meet this challenge."

Publishers of the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal replied that the union statement "is a fair sample of negotiation by ultimatum." They asserted that "until there

is a sincere desire by the union to negotiate—not dictate—a settlement" there will be no progress toward peace in the strike.

The complete text of the statements follows:

THE UNIONS

"We are united on a negotiating program with the publishers of Portland's strike-bound newspapers. The decision for common action by all newspaper unions was forced upon us by the blatant union-busting techniques employed by the publishers.

"The international unions cannot afford and do not intend to permit their local unions to be destroyed by a giant newspaper chain and its Portland satellite. The labor movement of Portland and the entire State of Oregon cannot afford to permit this return to labor's dark ages.

"Since the strike began on November 10, management has consistently raised its demands on the unions instead of seeking a peaceful and honorable solution at the bargaining table or through mediation efforts of Governor Hatfield or a factfinding committee. Chief of these new and outrageous demands is a management proposal that the stereotypers take a 12½-percent hourly pay cut despite the constantly increasing cost of living.

"The publishers have chosen to make this an all-out fight. We must meet their challenge. We pledge the utmost support of the international unions to assure that this union-busting venture by the publishers is not successful.

"Contracts of all of the mechanical craft unions have now expired. We reaffirm our decision that no union will return to work at the two newspapers until settlements are reached will all of the unions with expired contracts. Striking employees will return to work without fear of reprisal or discrimination. The unions agree that all contracts must have a common expiration date. All contracts must contain a clause allowing all unions to respect picket lines at the newspaper plants.

"The publishers are publicly tied in a common front against unions, and have consistently rejected all union offers to negotiate separate contracts with the Oregon Journal and the Oregonian. This stone wall of publisher opposition has today created the most significant and far-reaching team effort by international newspaper unions in the history of the American newspaper industry."

THE PUBLISHERS

"New roadblocks to peaceful settlement of Portland's newspaper strike have been raised by the statement of the united union committee. It has reaffirmed and now made common cause of a series of demands presented by the Stereotypers Union at the first bargaining session that followed the strike.

"It is a fair sample of negotiation by ultimatum which has marked the sorry course of the union's procedures through 18 bargaining sessions that preceded the strike and the 7 that have followed it.

"The adamant attitude revealed by the unions places on the public record absolute proof of the conspiracy that existed among the unions and the Guild. This conspiracy impaired negotiations, brought rejection of the publishers' offer to arbitrate unresolved issues and now bars the solution of strike problems.

"Among the demands that carry the odor of conspiracy are:

"That settlements must be reached with all unions as a prior condition of the return to work by any union.

"That all contracts must have a common expiration date.

"That all contracts contain a clause allowing any union to respect the picket line of another union.

"Settlement with all 15 unions at once presents an almost unsurmountable barrier. That should be amply evident. Problems vary widely from craft to craft. The demand for a common expiration date is a tacit admission that the then existing contracts did not permit members of these crafts to walk out at will. It substantiates the publishers' position that this action was in violation of moral and legal obligations under those contracts.

"The demand for a clause to legalize the respecting of another union's picket line likewise demonstrates that no such authority existed under old contracts. It validates the publishers' claim that such action was in violation of moral and legal obligations under the contracts.

"The fact that they are now demanding these provisions demonstrates conclusively a belated recognition of the impropriety of their previous action.

"Inference that the publishers' had attempted to reduce the take-home pay of stereotypers by demands since the strike is deceitful. The companies had stated merely that the 40-hour week, common to all industry, would be appropriate in the post strike period. The weekly wage would remain exactly the same.

"Other accusations are the usual abusive attacks to which the public has become accustomed. They have no validity, even to the charge that the newspapers had refused to negotiate separately. Joint negotiation has been the historic procedure, approved for more than 50 years both by unions and newspapers. All negotiations have been handled by representatives of both the Oregonian and Oregon Journal—and will continue to be.

"Until there is a sincere desire by the unions to negotiate—not dictate—a settlement, no progress will be made in bringing peace to the newspaper strike front in this city."

RETURNING NEWSPAPER WORKERS REPLY TO CHARGES OF "DEFIANCE" BY GUILD

Eighteen members of the Portland Newspaper Guild who have returned to work on the Oregonian-Oregon Journal Thursday signed the letter answering charges made by the guild and demanding their expulsion.

Signers of the reply included Jessie B. Williams, Harold Hughes, Rolla J. Crick, Gerry Pratt, W. L. Hunter, Les T. Ordeman, David Falconer, Ruth Needoba, Arnold Marks, Lawrence Barber, Watford Reed, Beth Fagan, Max Wauchope, Phyllis Lauritz, Florence H. Harris, Herb Alden, Jack Ostergren, and Walter Hilbruner.

STATEMENT MADE

Their reply follows:

"PORTLAND NEWSPAPER GUILD
TRIAL BOARD.

"The undersigned wish to reply to charges raised by individuals of the Portland Newspaper Guild. Members of the group which received identical letters feel that a single reply is proper, even though their decisions to return to work were individual rather than a collective action. This reply does not mean that certain signers may not appear to present additional argument on the merits of their own cases, although this letter for a majority of the accused guildsmen will stand in lieu of any personal testimony before the trial board.

"This consensus was obtained from the undersigned:

"1. The Guild, in voting to observe the stereotypers' picket lines and by subsequent actions in supporting the strike when the Guild had no dispute with management, violated its contract and put in jeopardy gains made in that contract over the past 20 years. Guildsmen who returned to work felt they could not in good faith continue a dishonest action even though it was led by the Guild's officers and supported by a majority of the membership.

"The Guild's officers must recall that during negotiations in recent years the Guild has sought to have included in the contract a clause giving the Portland unit the right to refrain from crossing a picket line. Such a clause has been denied by management and does not now appear in the contract.

"The numerous and insistent demands by various Guild negotiating teams that such a clause be placed in the contract is proof that the negotiators of the contract did not feel the Guild had a right to observe picket lines during the life of the contract.

"2. The Federal law clearly states that union members have a right to assist or refrain from assisting any union: That it is an unfair labor practice for a union to coerce or restrain union members from these rights which are paramount to any phrases in the guild constitution or bylaws. Thus, coercing members with these charges is an unfair labor practice.

"We refer the Guild trial board to section 8(b)(1) of the amended (1959) version of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, commonly called the Taft-Hartley law and the Landrum-Griffin Act. This section makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to restrain or coerce employees in the exercise of rights guaranteed in section 7, which is entitled 'Rights of Employees.' This section which was in the old Taft-Hartley law and is repeated in the Landrum-Griffin Act says employees 'shall have the right to refrain from any or all of such activities except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment as authorized in section 8(a)(3).'

"As you know, the Guild has a maintenance of membership dues agreement, it has no requirement forcing an employee to join a union, and it cannot, without engaging in unfair labor practices, cause discrimination against an employee except for failure to tender periodic dues.

"3. It is obvious the phrase 'working for or in a shop which is on strike' does not define 'strike,' and that the phrase is meaningless, since past practices of the Guild have found its members working inside scores of plants where one or more crafts are on strike. If this phrase has any legal standing at all (what about contracts with nonstrike clauses?) it must refer to actions in which the Guild itself is on strike.

"During the 1949 strike of Portland web pressmen, various Guildsmen worked inside picket lines, even when the papers were not publishing and virtually no jobs were available at the newspapers.

"In the Portland situation, we have one craft demanding its members take individual actions vis-a-vis the stereotyper strike and another craft (Guild) demanding its members take action as a unit. Both these demands are legalistic efforts to thwart contracts signed in good faith. These tactics are expedient devices to lend legal color to a shameful action against a management with which the Guild had no dispute. They are the methods of an international bent on finding a way, a loophole, to impose its will on the local unit which bargained in good faith. These methods resulted in the Guild losing its local autonomy when its membership was told by an international vice president that its charter would be lifted if the members voted to return to work.

"4. The charge of failing to follow the vote of a majority of the Guild is prima facie spurious in light of the previously cited Federal law which has been upheld in court tests. We need not lecture good Guildsmen about the rights of individuals in a democratic society, rights protected by the law and the courts.

"The Guild is not a court, nor is it a legislative body. It is ironical that in seeking to impose fines, penalties, public reprimands or admonishments upon members attempting to live up to a contract, the Guild is proposing actions it would consider disgraceful if proposed by an employer of either of the two newspapers."

The Guild's notification of action proposed to be taken against the members who returned to work follows:

"DECEMBER 29, 1959.

"We, the undersigned, hereby accuse (name of member) of failing to honor a majority decision of his fellow members of the Portland Newspaper Guild in having crossed a picket line established by Stereotypers Local 48, and further charge him with 'working for or in a shop which is on strike' in defiance of article XII, section I, subsection E of the constitution of the American Newspaper Guild. We seek relief from further association with this member and ask for his dishonorable expulsion from the American Newspaper Guild and all of its affiliates, including the Portland Newspaper Guild, as provided in the 'procedures and trials' section of the article XII of the constitution of the American Newspaper Guild.

"TED WAGONER.
"WAYNE A. SCOTT.

"Under the provisions of article XII, ANG constitution, you have 10 days in which to file an answer with two copies to the above charges with the secretary-treasurer. You will then be given 10 days notice of a hearing before the trial panel of the Portland Newspaper Guild conducted under provisions of the ANG constitution.

"J. LYNN WYKOFF,
"Secretary-Treasurer."

[From the Oregon Journal, Jan. 11, 1960]

NEW TRY MADE TO DRAW GOVERNOR INTO WALKOUT

The president of the Stereotypers' Union renewed a suggestion Monday that the managements of the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal accept mediation of factfinding of Gov. Mark O. Hatfield or Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER in the strike which was called against the two papers November 10.

Publishers of the Oregonian and Journal said they found nothing new in the proposal and commented it appeared to be "an effort to project this dispute into the political arena."

Harley V. Flesvig, stereotyper president, made the suggestion following settlement of the steel strike with the aid of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and the Secretary of Labor.

Gov. Hatfield said:

"I have given no special consideration to it (the Portland newspaper strike) in the light of today's development. But I have been thinking about it right along. I am still hopeful we can get them together on a factfinding commission. That is the approach I would like to make and I am working toward that end."

The statements:

Harley V. Flesvig, stereoptyper president, said:

"The steel strike was settled today after both management and labor accepted voluntarily the terms of an agreement offered by Labor Secretary James Mitchell and Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON.

"In the 8-week-old newspaper strike, Governor Hatfield some time ago offered to help negotiate the dispute. Our union immediately accepted this proposal. The newspaper management rejected it.

"Shortly after that, Senator NEUBERGER suggested that Governor Hatfield appoint a factfinding committee to aid on clarifying the issues. Again our union readily agreed to this proposal. Management flatly turned it down.

"If the assistance of outside, impartial persons brought an end to the 8-month-old steel strike, why couldn't such help do the same in this situation?

"We sincerely hope that newspaper management will reconsider its earlier rejections of the proposals."

The publishers said:

"1. There is no reason to believe either the Governor, through mediation, or a factfinding committee could be any more effective in jarring the union loose from its untenable positions than has the Federal Mediation Service.

"2. The stereotypers have already elected to place factfinding in the hands of the National Labor Relations Board by filing unfair labor practice charges against the newspapers.

"3. The steel strike and the newspaper strike are vastly different. A steel shutdown affected virtually the entire national economy. By contrast, we are not shut down. We are publishing. Our readers, our advertisers and the interests of the Commonwealth are being served. Any adverse economic consequences have been largely obviated.

"4. The proposal appears, as before, an effort to project this dispute into the political arena. We do not believe that political intervention, at union behest, is indicated, nor do we believe it would be helpful."

THAT OUR READERS MAY KNOW—IS CONTRACT WITH UNION "WORTH DAMN"?—THE SANCTITY OF CONTRACTS—PART 2

The typographical unions built their strength, through the years, on the faithful observance of contracts. The unions would battle for wages and conditions but, once a contract was signed by a local and "underwritten" by the international, it was observed—and no monkey business.

Many a local has been ordered back to work by the international when it broke its contract. Sometimes the international sent in crews when outlaw locals refused to honor their word. And, historically, all crafts have crossed the picket lines of other crafts to carry out their contracts.

What has happened to the men of honor in these unions? In this dispute, by contrast with the past, we find international officers inciting locals to dishonor their contracts.

The other day a "summit" conference released an astonishing statement to the effect that union contracts had now ended, all but the Guild's. They were now free to take joint action as they desired. Further, they were going to demand a contract clause permitting them to observe picket lines of each other. This was an admission, on the face of it, that they had been violating their contracts for 7 weeks or so.

Is this just the position of "unenlightened employers?"

Suppose we quote from the "laws" of the International Typographical Union, largest of the craft unions. The laws are supposed to govern all members, including the mailers, a subordinate union which had a valid contract at the time of the strike. We quote from article VII, page 32:

"Subordinate unions of the International Typographical Union have a long and honorable history of compliance and fulfillment of all contract commitments. It is required that where contract commitments have been made such commitments are paramount and must be honored by the local unions parties thereto, as a matter of union policy only, subject to the limitations stated in the approval clause of such agreements without any assumption of liability thereunder by the International Typographical Union. This obligations cannot be considered to be mitigated or absolved because of picket lines established without authority provided in the local contract."

Leaders of other crafts have stood honorably, in the past, for observance of contracts. As late as September 1956, Frank R. Adams, first vice president of the International Stereotypers Union, told the union convention in Seattle:

No local had a right to disregard a contract in order to honor the picket line of another union.

Such action would be a contract violation and subject the union to suit.

No strike or "lockout" benefits would be paid by the international.

"A labor contract, which has been approved by the local and duly signed by its elected representatives and authorized representatives of a company, is just as sacred and binding as any other contract. It has been negotiated for the mutual protection of both parties."

This was no employer speaking. This was a labor leader, a vice president of the Stereotypers Union, the very same union that incited other locals to violate contracts with the Oregonian and Journal.

Recently a labor lawyer told a Portland businessman, who had contracts with a group of unions, that his agreements were worthless.

"Everyone knows," he said, cynically, "that contracts are binding on corporations. So far as the unions are concerned, they are not worth a damn."

It is the view of the publishers that a contract binding on management alone is no contract. Here is a central issue in this strike—the honorable observance of contracts. Let union apologists come down off their absurd propaganda fantasies and answer the simple question:

"Is the contract with a union worth a damn?"

Mr. MORSE. Next, Mr. President, in fairness, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, representative newspaper articles and editorials which set forth the position of the employees who are involved in the Portland newspaper dispute.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Labor Press, Nov. 20, 1959]

STRIKEBREAKERS IMPORTED—OREGONIAN LION SAYS HE WON'T EAT THE LAMB

The strike of the Stereotypers' Union against Portland's two daily newspapers quickened in tempo this week with these major developments:

1. A charge by Edward J. Whelan, executive secretary of the Multnomah County Labor Council, that the strike was deliberately incited by the management of the Oregonian as part of a plot to give Samuel Newhouse, wealthy New York publisher, complete control of public communications in Portland.

2. A demand by Whelan for a congressional investigation of this potential newspaper monopoly.

3. An unprecedented importation into Portland of strikebreakers from the anti-union Deep South and other sections of the country to enable Newhouse and the Journal to publish a combined paper in the Oregonian building.

4. A stepping up of picket line activity with members of the Typographical and Mailers' Unions joining the Stereotypers in picketing the two newspaper plants.

5. A request by Whelan for an investigation of the strikebreaker situation by the State legislature's interim committee on labor-management relations.

6. The refusal of the Engravers' Union to cross the picket line, thus providing a solid front of all of Portland's newspaper unions in support of the Stereotypers.

Whelan's charges that the strike was deliberately incited by the Oregonian management were made in an address to the labor council Monday night.

Whelan's statement was called false and libelous by the publishers of the two newspapers, who attempted to stop the Oregon Labor Press from publishing the Whelan charges.

Whelan said:

"The Stereotypers and other newspaper unions were deliberately pushed into this strike to help the Oregonian carry out a plot to take over the Oregon Journal."

Whelan pointed out that Newhouse—who has a long record of anti-union activity—is the sole owner of the Oregonian, half-owner of KOIN-TV in Portland and head man of a nationwide empire of newspapers and TV stations.

"Newhouse would like to buy the Journal, print both newspapers in one building, and set up a complete newspaper monopoly in Oregon's largest city," Whelan continued.

"A newspaper monopoly in Portland would give the absentee owner Newhouse and his hand-picked local managers complete political domination of the State of Oregon—for the Oregonian and the Journal are the only two newspapers with statewide circulation."

Whelan said the matter of newspaper monopoly is "so serious that I am demanding a congressional investigation, and am sending copies of these remarks to the members of Oregon's delegation in Congress."

Whelan quoted a Journal executive as saying after the strike started:

"This strike situation means the windup of the Journal and the windup of me. The Oregonian is going to take us over when this strike is done."

Whelan also said that the Oregonian carries strike insurance, but the Journal does not, and the Oregonian has been making "substantial profits, but the Journal has recently been in financial difficulties."

As far as the differences between the unions and the newspapers are concerned, they "could be settled in half an hour—just as they were peacefully settled in Seattle and Tacoma a few days ago," Whelan declared. "But the Oregonian doesn't want to settle—not until it gets its hands on the Journal and transforms Portland into a monopoly newspaper town.

"Oregonians had better wake up. The hours of honest competition among newspapers may be fast running out."

In an effort to stop the Oregon Labor Press from publishing Whelan's statement, the publishers of the Oregonian and Oregon Journal telephoned Labor Press Editor Jim Goodsell at 12:45 p.m., Tuesday.

Oregonian publisher M. J. Frey and Journal publisher William W. Knight said they were calling from Frey's office in the Oregonian Building. They warned that the Labor Press would face possible libel action if it published Whelan's charges.

Frey said: "Whelan's statement is libelous, malicious, and entirely false. We absolutely deny it. It is a false statement."

Knight said: "The statement is false, malicious, libelous, and without any basis of fact."

Goodsell commented: "The lion and the lamb have now denied that the lamb will be eaten."

Publisher Frey is an employee of the Oregonian's absentee owner, Samuel I. Newhouse, of New York.

Publisher Knight is one of three trustees of the Jackson estate, any two of whom could sell the Journal. The other trustees are David L. Davies, Portland attorney, and the U.S. National Bank.

Ted Cotner, chairman of the stereotypers' negotiating committee, also warned the labor council of the vicious situation that would result if Portland were to become a one-newspaper town.

"You would have one-sided news coverage and advertising rates would go up," Cotner said.

The Stereotyper spokesman said his union feels "this is a planned strike, formulated over a year ago to make this a one-newspaper town."

"Time and again," he said, "we offered to negotiate separately with the Journal because we feel the need for a hometown paper. But we were turned down flatly on that."

Speaking for the Typographical Union, Chet Rooklidge told the labor council of the frustrating, futile efforts his union had made since September 15 in trying to reach an agreement on terms of a new contract with the Journal and the Oregonian.

He said the management representatives at the bargaining table wanted to "talk about everything from pressmen, stereotypers, mailers, and Mrs. Fogarty's cat—but we couldn't pin a tail on the cat."

"It's hard to negotiate a contract when, by the admission of the people on the other side, their counterproposal is written 5 or 6 months before you ever sit down to negotiate."

The decision of the engravers to respect the stereotypers' picket line brings to 10 the number of unions whose members are supporting the strike. They are the Typographical, Web Pressmen, Mailers, Photoengravers, Newspaper Guild (reporters, photographers, some editors, artists, and some circulation office employees), Electrical Workers, Machinists, Teamsters, Building Service Employees, and Operating Engineers.

An estimated 750 union employees of both newspapers are out of work as a result of the strike, with their jobs being taken over by scabs, many of them from as far away as Florida.

Meanwhile, Federal Mediator Elmer Williams continued efforts to try to settle the strike. In a Tuesday session conducted by Williams, the publishers made a counterproposal which Cotner said indicated they "apparently are trying to widen the breach in this dispute rather than trying to bring us closer together and reach a peaceful settlement."

The counterproposal made by management would have required the Stereotypers to work 5 hours longer a week at no raise in wages. They also wanted a no-strike clause in the contract and an agreement by the union to pay for any financial damages to the companies if the union violated this clause.

The publishers also asked for elimination of union security, an issue which Cotner said was agreed to between the parties before the strike.

STRIKEBREAKERS

The use of imported professional strikebreakers—one of them armed with rifles and shotguns—spurred mounting indignation of Portlanders this week against the tactics of the Oregonian and the Journal in their efforts to break the strike of the Stereotypers' Union.

For the first time in Portland's newspaper history, the two dailies are bringing in nonunion workers from other States—some from as far away as Florida—to publish a combined scab paper in the Oregonian Building.

The situation brought a request from State Representative Edward J. Whelan, who is secretary of the Multnomah County Labor Council, for a special investigation by the legislature's interim committee on labor-management relations.

It also prompted a prediction by a Republican legislator that the next legislative session will consider seriously making such activity by employers illegal.

"This is the kind of thing you might expect in the Deep South, which is notoriously anti-union, but it's not what we expect to see happen here in Oregon," he said.

And the Stereotypers' Union, through its attorney, Don Richardson, has asked the U.S. district attorney to examine the possibility that a Federal law may have been violated by bringing in strikebreakers from other States.

Whelan, in his telegram to Senator Harry Boivin, chairman of the legislative interim committee on labor-management relations, asserted that the importation of strikebreakers is having a detrimental effect on efforts to obtain a speedy settlement of the strike.

"There is a gap in Oregon labor law with respect to the detrimental effect the importation of strikebreakers has on a labor dispute," said Whelan.

"Calling the committee into session to examine the role of strikebreakers in the Portland newspaper strike would give committee members a first-hand view of the situation. It would be of immeasurable help in implementing Oregon law at the next legislature to prohibit the importation of strikebreakers in future labor disputes in the State."

Whelan urged Senator Boivin to "call the committee into session in Portland as soon as possible."

The incident of the armed strikebreaker was reported by Portland police. The scab, imported to work at the Oregonian during the strike, was spotted by police checking into a downtown hotel with several rifles and shotguns.

The publishers of the combined Oregonian-Journal admitted in a published statement that the man's actions were "potentially provocative" in view of the strike and added that "he was no longer employed."

The stereotypers said that the imported scabs manning the presses and setting type for the Oregonian-Journal had been flown into Portland from Iowa, Texas, Louisiana, Florida, and Nevada. They are paid a minimum of $200 a week plus expenses.

"This is the way Portland publishers seek to break a strike of local employees who have lived in the city for many years," said the stereotypers in a printed bulletin.

"The tactic is seen as a turn-back-the-clock move to the dark ages of labor-management history—a chapter foreign to Portland labor relations," the bulletin added.

"FEATHERBEDDING" IS NOT NEWSPAPER STRIKE ISSUE

Can the truth ever catch up with false propaganda?

That is the burning question in the Portland newspaper strike.

The public has been convinced that "featherbedding" is the key issue in the strike.

They have been told by the publishers that one small union—the Stereotypers—is fighting against labor-saving machinery and insisting on unreasonable "make work" rules.

This stubborn stand, the publishers claim, is the reason why the stereotypers have gone out on strike and why 750 other newspaper union men and women have left their jobs in sympathy.

Don't you believe it.

The fact is that this strike was deliberately provoked by the Oregonian—not by the union—and "featherbedding" is an issue trumped up by management.

Read these facts and judge for yourself:

1. In 18 negotiating sessions, the stereotypers offered one compromise after another. The newspapers flatly turned them down.

2. The publishers refused to discuss wages, hours or any other basic issue. First, they insisted the union must agree in advance on

all details of operating an unknown, unseen, unordered, untried, untested, German-made machine which the Oregonian said it plans to buy.

The German-made machine is new and completely unknown. It is not in use on any newspaper in North America.

It is dangerous because it operates with molten metal, under high pressure, at temperatures over 600 degrees.

The Oregonian has not ordered or bought the machine; the newspaper merely says it intends to buy one. The Journal has no interest in the machine at all.

More than a year will go by before the machine can possibly be delivered.

Yet the publishers refused to bargain on any other issue unless the Stereotypers Union would agree (sight unseen) to one-man operation of the machine—when and if it is delivered.

This was an ultimatum that no union could possibly accept—and the publishers knew it.

3. The stereotypers tried desperately to compromise, and to continue the process of collective bargaining. They did not want to strike.

They offered to reopen their contract when the German machine is delivered, and to decide then with the Oregonian how many men can safely operate the machine. The publishers refused.

The union offered two other compromises, both of them fair and reasonable. Again the publishers refused.

4. The Oregonian and Journal demanded that working foremen be removed from union membership. These foreman don't sit at a desk and give orders. They work side by side with the other stereotypers. They now belong to the union; they have always belonged to the union, and they want to belong to the union.

5. The publishers demanded that the stereotypers work 2½ hours longer each week for the same pay.

6. The publishers were just as stubborn and unreasonable in 13 negotiating sessions with another union, the Typographical Union, whose contract expired September 15.

"They were deliberately stalling and goading us with their demands," a Typographical delegate told the County Labor Council this week.

"We are sure that the Typographical Union would have been forced to strike if the stereotypers had not gone out first," he declared, "and nobody has claimed that the Typos were making any so-called featherbedding demands."

"Featherbedding" is a red herring in the newspaper strike. Three very significant facts will tell you the real reason for the strike:

The Oregonian carries strike insurance. The Journal does not.

The Oregonian raised the strike-provoking issue of the German machine. The Journal has no interest in the machine.

The Oregonian has been making big profits. The Journal has been in financial difficulties.

We believe that the Oregonian and its absentee owner, Samuel Newhouse of New York, have two purposes in this strike: To break the unions and to break the Journal.

That would give Newhouse and his imported strikebreakers a complete monopoly in the city of Portland, Oreg.

TO BREAK NEWSPAPER STRIKES: ARMED STRIKEBREAKERS IMPORTED

Men armed with rifles and shotguns walked into a downtown Portland hotel Sunday morning and registered as "guests."

Who are these men? They are professional strikebreakers. Others without arms have been flown to Portland in the past week from Iowa, Texas, Louisiana, Florida and Nevada.

The hybrid The Oregonian and Oregon Journal said Monday:

"Management, supervisory and other available personnel" are putting out the newspaper.

"Other available personnel" are professional strikebreakers. They are paid a minimum of $200 weekly plus all expenses.

This is the way Portland publishers seek to break a legitimate strike of local employees who have lived in the city for many years. These strikers for years have patronized local firms and contributed to United Good Neighbors and other community charities and activities.

Strikebreakers don't spend their money in Portland. They take it to Iowa, Florida, Texas, Louisiana, and Nevada.

Some Portland firms are canceling their advertising during the strike. They are using direct mail, radio, and television. They are doing this in protest to the tactics of the newspaper industry.

Monday 360 members of the locked-out Printers' and Mailers' Unions joined the stereotypers' picket line to demonstrate their faith in the stereotypers' cause and their indignation at the cold-blooded tactics of their former bosses and "friends."

The importing of strikebreakers who live in luxury hotels and receive in pay and expenses more than twice the income of union workers is being subsidized in part by doubled advertising rates and doubled paper prices. The tactic is seen as a turn-back-the-clock move to the dark ages of labor-management history—a chapter foreign to Portland labor relations. Peace has prevailed in the news industry of Portland—no strikes—for the past 10 years. And never before have professional strikebreakers been used in the City of Roses.

The strikebreakers in their hotel lobbies openly boast of year-round employment in the art of breaking strikes, an art in which all earnings are cream because all living expenses are paid and are also deducted as a business expense. This makes Uncle Sam an unwitting partner.

The Oregonian-Oregon Journal boasts of press runs of 500,000 copies. But this is not paid circulation. Many copies are being scattered away as thousands of union families in Oregon and southwest Washington cancel their subscriptions. This throwaway distribution in some cases is littering lawns and causing economic hardship to carrier boys.

The men from out of State who walked into a downtown hotel carried four guns—two .22 rifles, a Savage shotgun, and a home-remodeled 410 shotgun. They were sealed in the hotel safe and reported to the police. The men said they came to Portland to work for the Oregonian.

Meantime unions instructed their pickets to patrol peacefully in the American tradition of fair play.

Union investigators are convinced the callous tactics of the two newspapers are being directed personally by S. I. Newhouse, absentee owner of the Oregonian. He is a man who has spent perhaps no more than a day or two in Portland since buying the newspaper on the telephone 9 years ago.

The use of strikebreakers has so shamed the local publishers that the sea-green windows designed by Pierto Belluschi in the Oregonian pressroom have been boarded up so that the public cannot see what is going on.

[From the Guild Reporter, Washington, D.C., Nov. 27, 1959]

ARMED SCAB CREW HITS COAST NEWSPAPER STRIKE

PORTLAND, OREG.—A stream of professional strikebreakers from other States, imported by the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal, has helped swing public opinion behind striking stereotypers at the two papers.

The quick appearance of the scabs, some of them bearing arms, also backed up the union's contention that the strike was deliberately provoked by management as a union-busting effort.

Representatives of the two papers later told a Guild committee that henceforth they planned to operate as open shops in all departments.

The Stereotypers Union struck at 5 a.m., Tuesday, November 5, after 18 fruitless negotiating sessions. Guild members, printers, mailers, pressmen, and other crafts refused to cross the picket lines placed around the two newspaper plants. In the confusion of the first week, photoengravers continued to work, except for 1 day, until Saturday, when they joined officially in support of the strike.

Printers and mailers, members of the International Typographical Union, joined the picket line on the grounds that they were locked out when they found scabs had taken over their positions on the first morning of the strike.

They said they found the doors locked and guarded.

On the eve of the walkout, the Portland Guild voted 68 to 30 not to cross the stereotypers' picket lines. Only a few circulation clerks among the 165 members of the local failed to abide by the decision.

With the help of scabs, nonunion personnel, and supervisors, managements of the two papers have combined to issue a hybrid daily under the flags of both the Oregonian and the Journal, hitherto supposedly fierce competitors. The paper is being published from the plant of the Oregonian, owned by S. I. Newhouse.

The move led the Multnomah County (Portland) Central Labor Council to call for a congressional inquiry into report that Newhouse and his Oregonian are maneuvering to take over the Journal.

It was the Oregonian's bargaining tactics that brought on the strike. The Newhouse interests insisted that the stereotypers agree in advance that only one man would be required to operate a new platecasting machine of German origin. The Oregonian management said it intends to acquire one of the machines, not yet in use in this country.

Wages never were discussed in negotiations after management stalled bargaining and refused to budge on the manning issue. By the time Federal mediators entered the talks, the papers also were insisting, among other things, on the removal of foremen from contract coverage, an increase in the workweek from 35 hours to 40 hours, and a no-strike clause for the duration of any contract.

In their propaganda campaign among readers, the two papers have pictured the stereotypers as a featherbedding union which demands the use of four men to operate a one-man machine.

The union, however, has offered to bypass the manning issue and proceed to other questions, with the contract to be reopenable on manning when and if the German machine is ever purchased.

Another investigation, by a State legislative subcommittee on labor-management relations, has been demanded by Ed Whelan, executive secretary of the Central Labor Council. Whelan, a member of the legislature himself, has urged the subcommittee to gather material to strengthen Oregon laws pertaining to the importation of out-of-State strikebreakers.

The unions also have asked the U.S. district attorney here to investigate the interstate traffic of armed strikebreakers to determine if there have been violations of Federal regulations.

The arms of two of the scabs—two rifles, a shotgun, and a sawed-off shotgun—were confiscated by police, who were alerted by a

desk clerk when the men attempted to check into a hotel with the guns. They had come here from Reno.

The Oregonian management at first denied it had brought the men to Portland, but later changed the denial to a statement that the two men were "no longer employed." The pair hurriedly left town, but dozens of others have remained, drawing a minimum of $200 a week and expenses at Portland hotels. Some of them have been sleeping in the Oregonian building.

It was learned, too, that the papers had been training advertising and business office personnel in advance of the strike to operate mechanical equipment.

Strike strategy is in the hands of a steering committee representing all unions. ANG International Representative Charles Dale, who has been here to aid the local guild since the first morning of the strike, has been named chairman of the coordinating body. Staff representatives of all other affected unions also are on hand. ANG Executive Vice President William J. Farson flew here last weekend to confer with local Guild leaders and officials of other unions and to attend a membership meeting.

The Portland Guild, which represents 96 percent of reporters, desk editors, and photographers in the newsroom of both dailies, has set up headquarters for the duration of the strike in a vacant store on Broadway in downstown Portland. Committees have been organized to seek temporary employment for Guild members and their families, to administer strike benefits, to aid families with financial difficulties, and to help the strike steering committee.

Guild members have been particularly active in publicity work in behalf of the unions involved. They have kept radio, television and other media on top of strike developments and informed of the strikers' story. They have also prepared and distributed 75,000 copies of one handbill and 100,000 copies of another, with more in the works.

Most Guildsmen have been carying out committee assignments in addition to other employment they have found since the strike started. Some of the more able-bodied male members have been working on the Portland docks through the cooperation of the Longshoremen's Union. Others have found temporary jobs in offices and stores around the city. Some have landed with public relations firms, and a few are working for local radio and TV stations, which have stepped up their news coverage.

Also easing the financial burden is the steady flow of contributions from other Guild locals. Seattle, San Francisco-Oakland and Los Angeles sent $100 contributions on th basis of wire service reports of the strike before any appeal for aid was issued from Portland.

The hybrid Oregonian-Journal has been a source of both amusement and irritation.

One page of the strikebreaker contained a story which started in column five and broke back, Chinese-style, through columns four, three, two, and one. Television schedules were unchanged from the previous week. Classified advertising, pasted up and photographed from electric typewriter copy, was nearly illegible. A fullpage display ad for Portland's leading department store promoted a new lightweight, portable typewriter weighing only 86 pounds.

The executives and other amateurs producing the makeshift sheet also were having circulation problems, largely as a result of snowballing subscription cancellations. Thousands of residents who canceled subscriptions continued to receive the combined daily. Thousands of others who didn't cancel weren't getting the paper. Distribution appeared to be on a throwaway basis.

There has been no comment yet from advertisers on the plans of the papers, reported in Editor & Publisher, for double billing of space in the hybrid paper. Said the Editor & Publisher story:

"Advertisers in the current issues will be billed by both newspapers at each advertiser's contract rate. An advertiser with a contract at only one of the papers will be billed by both at that contract rate."

The first few days of the strike were bitterly cold for Portland, but the weather has since moderated and pickets now face only the usual Oregon rain. Guild members have been on duty on the lines daily, with stereotypers and printers, to observe the comings and goings of strikebreakers and keep the membership informed of general activity.

[From the Oregon Labor Press, Dec. 4, 1959]

STRIKEBREAKERS ARE HERE—HIRED PROFESSIONALS PRINTING OREGOURNAL

Professional strikebreakers are working in Portland.

Names and hometowns of more than 70 of them are published on this page.

Most of them come from the Deep South and Southwest.

They are imported by the Oregonian and Oregon Journal to take the jobs of the striking members of the Stereotypers Union. They have also taken the jobs of printers, engravers, pressmen, mailers and paperhandlers who are honoring the stereotypers' picket lines.

Elimination of the unions from the mechanical departments of the Oregonian and Journal is the motive of the Portland publishers.

Strike insurance, which can pay the Portland publishers up to $500,000 over an 8-week period, provides the financial backing.

Provoke a strike, collect the strike insurance and call in a flying squad of professional strikebreakers. This is the pattern being followed by publishers all over the country. If the unions are divided and the general public misled, then the union-busting publisher is successful.

Who are the strikebreakers? Where did they come from? What is the role of the American Newspaper Publishers Association? Was this strike deliberately provoked by the publishers?

Here are some of the answers:

L. R. McCoy of Oklahoma City or Galveston, Tex., was sent here by the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association (an affiliate of the American Newspaper Publishers Association) to ride herd on the strikebreakers. He is staying at the Benson Hotel. He is a veteran strikebreaker. He has worked on similar strikebreaking jobs in Las Vegas, Nev.; Kennewick, Wash.; Oklahoma City, and Galveston. Members of his family, Hunter G. and Virginia McCoy, worked as strikebreakers in Ypsilanti, Mich., earlier this year.

McCoy was once a member of the International Typographical Union. He was suspended for nonpayment of dues in 1946.

McCoy's presence in Portland presumably relieves the Portland publishers of the distasteful chore of dealing directly with the strikebreakers.

McCoy in Portland is filling the same position, chief herder of the strikebreakers, that he filled in the Galveston strikebreaking attempt in 1957.

Also on hand at the Oregonian building are Bill and Justine Glover. These two were in Ypsilanti, Mich., in November of last year as key personnel in a Bloor Schleppey-Shirley Klein strikebreaking attempt. Justine's specialty is the training of teletypesetter operators.

Bloor Schleppey and Shirley Klein are the unholy alliance who operate a professional strikebreaking service for the American Newspaper Publishers Association. They were exposed to public view recently by an investigating committee of the New York State Legislature which probed their activities in Westchester County, N.Y.

There has been no definite proof that Schleppey-Klein is directly involved in Portland. But there are numerous Schleppey-Klein alumni among the Portland strikebreakers. This may not be a Schleppey-Klein operation, but the methods used here are certainly copied from the Schleppey-Klein strikebreaking handbook.

Bloor Schleppey of Zionsville, Ind., has been described by Time magazine as a man who has a role in American journalism as unusual as his name: he breaks strikes for pay.

Schleppey claims he gets his strikebreakers on a volunteer basis from the nonunion composing rooms of some of his newspaper clients.

The Typographical Union's dossier on Schleppey claims that his flying squads are mostly drunks, misfits, social cripples, and are generally incompetent in their work.

Time magazine reports that within days of the arrival of a Schleppey gang in Haverhill, Mass., for a strikebreaking job for the Haverhill Gazette, several of the recruits were arrested for drunkenness and disorderly conduct.

Schleppey has often been scheduled as a convention speaker by the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

Besides the McCoys and the Glovers, strikebreakers with Schleppey experience who have now shown up in Portland are Morris Smith, of Bastrop, La.; John T. Mott, West Monroe, La.; Warren Smith, Durant, Va.; Yancy Darbo, El Centro, Calif., and Bill Mills and wife Sally Mills, of Levittown, Pa.

Among the strikebreakers, some of whom arrived in Portland on the first and second days of the strike, were F. E. Early, of Reno, Nev.. and Kenneth G. Comstock, of Jacksonville, Fla.

Early and Comstock checked into the Hungerford Hotel with two rifles, a shotgun and a sawed-off shotgun. The publishers at first denied these men had been hired, then changed their story to admit that their actions might be considered provocative and said they were no longer employed.

Early has disappeared, but Comstock has reportedly been seen several times between the Hungerford Hotel and the Oregonian building.

Another armed member of the troupe is Max L. Rue, of Mahoae, N.Y. He is the paymaster, or swag man, for the strikebreakers.

Charles E. Richards, of Houston, Tex., is in town with his wife and daughter. His wife has reportedly stated that her husband has participated in strikebreaking operations in Kansas, Missouri, West Virginia, New York, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Michigan.

Many strikebreakers are openly boastful of their line of work. They flaunt their ill-gotten gains, $200 and $300 per week plus overtime and expenses. They tell of this being my sixth (third, fourth, fifth) straight strike.

Some have qualms. One said, "I know this is a pretty dirty thing, but think of the money."

James Younger, of Fort Smith, Ark., is working at the Oregonian. He was strikebreaking in Reno last spring and summer. He was encountered in a Reno casino with four other strikebreakers by two persons who are now in Portland on legitimate business. On hearing that the two would be in Portland later in the year, the strikebreakers said, "We'll see you in Portland."

These are the "other available personnel" the publishers talk about. These are the men and women the publishers say have been promised "permanent employment."

These are the people who feed on frustration and misfortune in labor negotiations. When the Portland strike is settled they will take off for the next strike. They don't participate in community affairs or support community charities. They accept community services without helping to pay for

them. They stay at luxury hotels mostly, but some are living in the security-guarded newspaper plant.

Importation of strikebreakers is something new for Portland. It is not new, however, in the newspaper industry in other parts of the country.

This has happened in Levittown and Bristol, Pa., in Westchester County, N.Y., in Haverhill, Mass., in Ypsilanti, Mich., in Oklahoma City, in Galveston, Tex., in Reno, Nev., and many other places.

Importation of strikebreakers was the cause of a legislative investigation in New York. Similar investigation has been planned in Pennsylvania. Congressional and State legislative investigation has been called for in the Portland situation.

One of the key findings of the New York investigation was that "availability of standby crews of strikebreakers tends to withdraw employer incentive to bargain collectively * * * the existence of a strikebreaker pool incites to irresponsible and negative behavior instead of good faith, interchange of proposals, and supporting argument."

That labor-management relations in Portland have come to such a pass is inconceivable to many citizens. They fail to reckon with the profit-fascinated ownership of the Oregonian.

S. I. Newhouse, absentee owner of the Oregonian since 1950, is not the man who built the reputation of the Oregonian. That reputation was started and nurtured over a period of more than 100 years by Oregonians. S. I. Newhouse is not the man who won the Oregonian's Pulitzer prizes and Heywood Broun awards. These prizes were won for the Oregonian by reporters who are now supporting the stereotypers in their fight to retain legitimate contract provisions by collective bargaining.

S. I. Newhouse is the man who has brought armed strikebreakers to Portland.

STRIKEBREAKERS IDENTIFIED

Professional strikebreakers are in Portland.

Here are the names and hometowns of more than 70 of them.

They are producing the hybrid newspaper that used to be your hometown Oregonian and Oregon Journal.

Almost all of them come from the slave-wage Deep South and other far-off States.

They are hired professionals who make their living as strikebreakers, moving from city to city and from strike to strike to help publishers break the printing trades unions.

They live like kings in local hotels, and send their average $200 weekly earnings back home to good ol' Tuskahoochee. Their expenses in Portland are paid by the publishers, who pick up their tabs for hotel rooms, food and liquor.

They are working in the Oregonian Building as printers, stereotypers, pressmen, engravers, and mailers.

Here is the list of those who have been identified—and undoubtedly there are more:

From Oklahoma: L. R. McCoy, Oklahoma City; Leon A. Minnick, Oklahoma City; Abel (Arvel) Green, Oklahoma City; M. E. Hawkins, Oklahoma City; William D. Wilson, Oklahoma City; Wayne M. Clark, Oklahoma City; B. J. Guy, Blair; J. Brenan, Oklahoma City; Alvin L. Winn, Oklahoma City; B. J. Wood, Oklahoma City; B. H. Boles, Oklahoma City; Mrs. Sue Sherry, Oklahoma City; M. L. Gardner, Oklahoma City.

From Louisiana: J. T. Mott, West Monroe; Mrs. J. T. (Doris) Mott, West Monroe; Richard Munson, Baton Rouge; M. Smith, Bastrop; E. J. Willhite, Bastrop; Charles Chastant, Baton Rouge; L. Maxwell, Monroe; P. Moak, Winnsboro; P. Purvis, Monroe; J. P. McCarthy, Monroe; Grover Dunn, Monroe; Linton A. Kellum, Alexandria; Steve Moore (with two companions), Monroe.

From Texas: Bill Glover, Houston; Justine Glover, Houston; V. G. Vinson, Abilene; T. E. Smith, Wichita Falls; Lee Norton, Wichita Falls; B. E. Byrd, Henderson; Charles E. Richards (with two companions), Houston.

From Florida: J. Fikes, Miami; Kenneth G. Comstock, Jacksonville; E. Light, Miami; J. E. Nelson, Miami; G. Charles, Miami; Roy Chesser, Miami; B. A. (Betty) Coxe, Miami; G. K. Carastun, Jacksonville.

From Arkansas: R. Jennings, Eldorado; Howard G. Elliott, Hot Springs; James Younger, Fort Smith.

From Nevada: F. E. Early, Reno; E. G. Miner, Reno; Don Premer, Reno; D. B. Anderson, Reno; James Miller, Reno.

From Illinois: John Mitchum, East Moline; Bobby Smith, Rock Island; Mrs. E. Hansen, Galesburg.

From Pennsylvania: Donald Leeking, Liteh; Dick Brooks, Levittown; George Crothers, Bristol; Bill Mills, Levittown.

From Iowa: Bob Bushek, Davenport; Joanne Hodgkins, Davenport.

From Mississippi: William Goodfellow, Natchez.

From West Virginia: Virgil Lockhart, Huntington.

From Virginia: Warren Smith, Durant.

From New Jersey: Curt Scrum, Palisades.

From New York: Max L. Rue, Mahoae.

From Maine: L. W. Davis, Seymour.

From Ohio: Richard Axline, Zanesville.

From California: Yancy F. Darbro, El Centro.

From Washington: Sylvia Duran, Pasco; C. E. Benjamin, Kennewick.

From Oregon: Mrs. W. H. Allen, Cottage Grove.

WIVES OF TYPOS THREATENED

Threatening telephone calls were received this week by the wives of three members of the locked-out Multnomah Typographical Union.

Mrs. Leroy Blubaum, wife of the union's president, was called and told that her husband had better quit his union activities and resign from his position as president of the union or "watch out."

Mrs. Leta Rooklidge, wife of Chester Rooklidge who is a member of the union's negotiating committee, was called and told substantially the same thing. Included in the call to Mrs. Rooklidge was the threat that if Rooklidge did not stop his union "agitation" he would be in for great physical harm.

Mrs. Robert Burgess, wife of a member of the union, was the target of a slightly different type of call. She was told that the caller had pictures of both her and her husband. The caller said Mrs. Burgess was a "ring leader" in the "mob at the Oregonian Friday." (Mrs. Burgess participated in a peaceful demonstration by union wives at the Oregonian building). Mrs. Burgess was told: "You had better quit campaigning, you're no Carrie Nation and you had better watch out."

Mrs. Burgess was warned not to go out by herself on the streets, that it "might be dangerous." She was told to think twice before answering the telephone, that it "might be a window play."

The caller said, "After all the smart ones are weeded out and only the foolish remain, watch out."

The calls, received between 9 and 11 p.m. Monday, were believed to be the work of the same psychopathic personality. The calls were reported to the police.

The caller, a woman, spoke in a calm, clear, unhurried voice with no noticeable accent. She appeared to be quite well informed on the more spectacular aspects of the newspaper strike.

STEREOTYPER PRESIDENT REPORTS: DETROIT PAPERS SETTLE IN 7 HOURS ALL ISSUES OF PORTLAND'S STRIKE

Arrival in Portland of James H. Sampson, international president of the Stereotypers' Union, and the resumption of talks between publishers of the Oregonian-Journal and union negotiators were the only concrete developments this week in Portland's 24-day-old newspaper strike.

Sampson brought the report that all issues involved in the stereotypers' strike against the Portland papers were settled last Saturday in 1 day of negotiation with publishers of the Detroit Times, Free Press, and News.

Sampson said the issue of the German-made M.A.N. machine, a roadblock in the way of a Portland settlement, was settled in Detroit on substantially the same basis as proposed by the Portland stereotyper negotiators. That is that the manning of the machine be negotiated between union and management after the machine has been installed and both sides have had a chance to see it in operation.

Union membership of foremen was left up to each individual in Detroit. The substitution issue was also settled amicably in Detroit in the single negotiation session which lasted 7 hours.

The stereotyper president and the local union representatives met with Portland management all day Tuesday and again Wednesday through the efforts of Federal Mediator Elmer Williams.

After the Tuesday session, Sampson said, "We got nowhere today. Nothing was accomplished."

Management representatives, D. S. Haines and W. R. Morrish, at Tuesday's session refused to allow television cameramen to take pictures of them seated around the table with union representatives, including Sampson. Newsfilm on local TV stations showed the union men and Sampson at the table, but the only shots of management representatives showed them walking into the room.

THE JOURNAL FLIES INTO THE NEWHOUSE TRAP

Why does Portland have a newspaper strike?

President James H. Sampson, of the Stereotypers' International Union, said in Portland this week that the whole question of the new German stereotyping machine was recently settled by Detroit newspaper publishers and stereotypers in 7 hours of honest collective bargaining.

All of the other key issues of the Portland strike were settled in Detroit in the same 7-hour session.

They were settled peacefully, swiftly, and to the satisfaction of the newspapers and the union.

Three months ago the publishers of Seattle's two big daily newspapers signed a new 2-year contract with the printing trades unions. This contract granted the same improvements in wages and fringe benefits that Portland printers, stereotypers, and other unions have been trying patiently, for many months, to negotiate with the Oregonian and Oregon Journal.

Then why does Portland have a newspaper strike?

Why all the bitterness? Why all the cost? Why the inconveniences? Why the broken friendships? Why the sickening sight of imported strikebreakers scuttling into the Oregonian building?

There is only one reason: This strike was deliberately planned and incited by the Oregonian and the Journal.

To be more accurate, it was planned by the Oregonian's absentee owner, Samuel Newhouse, of New York, who somehow holds the locally owned Journal as his captive partner.

The newspaper unions didn't want the strike. They tried desperately to avoid it. They offered one compromise after another in their efforts to reach a peaceful and honorable settlement.

What did they get in return from the publishers?

They got ultimatums. They got delays. They got legalistic maneuvers. They got evasions and runarounds. They got demands that the publishers knew no union could accept.

A spokesman for the Typographical Union reports: "They kept goading, prodding, needling, stalling, evading. If we dared to back down on one issue, we knew they would replace it with a new and more impossible demand. Finally we reached the only possible conclusion: They wanted us to strike."

If anyone still doubts that this strike was deliberately planned by the publishers, let him consider this evidence:

1. The lightning speed with which dozens of professional strikebreakers appeared in Portland from cities thousands of miles away.

2. In Reno last July, a group of professional strikebreakers told a Portland woman that they had "a date to break a strike in Portland next winter." These men were then working behind picket lines at the Reno Gazette and Journal.

3. The Oregonian (if not the Journal) carries strike insurance covering all losses for 50 days.

4. Gov. Mark Hatfield offered to mediate a settlement of the strike, and the unions promptly accepted. The Oregonian and Journal flatly rejected the Governor's offer.

Finally, consider this fact:

Samuel Newhouse, absentee owner of the Oregonian, owns 13 other newspapers in the East and Midwest. Since last June, six of these newspapers have peacefully negotiated new long-term contracts with the printing trades unions.

None of the so-called "issues" of the Portland strike were raised by Newhouse's representatives in these negotiations.

We can draw only one conclusion: Newhouse deliberately chose Portland as his battleground. He ordered his local managers to force a strike. He decided to tear this town apart, if necessary, in a cold-blooded grab for more money and power.

Why did he choose Portland?

There is one obvious answer: Newhouse wants to buy the Oregonian's afternoon competitor, the Journal. A long strike will bleed the Journal white, while the Oregonian is propped up by its strike insurance and by the profits from 31 other Newhouse newspapers, magazines, and TV stations.

Why has the Journal fallen into the Newhouse trap?

The newspaper unions have repeatedly offered to negotiate independently with the Journal. But the Journal remains a captive in the Oregonian building. She no longer "flies with her own wings."

DR. STEINER'S SERMON—MINISTER ASKS NEWS STRIKE FACTS

The public's stake in the current strike-lockout at Portland's two daily newspapers was the subject of Dr. Richard M. Steiner's sermon last Sunday. Dr. Steiner is minister of the First Unitarian Church.

Dr. Steiner deplored the fact that the public is without adequate information upon which to render a judgment in dispute. "We are dependent upon rumors and upon the biased statements printed by the party that has control of the main avenue of information," he declared.

He called for the truth, and asked: "Can we trust the newspapers to give us the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?"

Half-truths, he noted, "can be as deceptive as outright lies."

Dr. Steiner said there are two reasons for the public's confusion over the newspaper strike. "In the first place," he said, "they cannot believe that the right is all on one side, and as far as the printed word is concerned, only one side has access to the newspapers and it quite obviously considers itself to be without fault in the present controversy."

He continued:

"When it comes to presenting their case to the public, the newspapers have all the advantage. We are, as a result, surfeited with rumors. Whether these rumors are deliberately incited or not, no one can say. Whether there is any truth in them or not, no one can say. We are told, for example, that the strike is a plot by the Oregonian to take over the Oregon Journal, which has been in financial difficulties. This has been denied, but anyone reading the denial must wonder if the publishers have not left themselves an out when they say 'at this time' they do not contemplate an absorption of the Oregon Journal into the Newhouse chain.

"We have heard that the issue is 'featherbedding,' that the union refuses to settle the issue as to how many men shall work on a machine for stereotyping that the Oregonian says it is going to purchase. I have heard it reported on one hand that the union is willing to arbitrate the number of men on the machine when, as, and if it is delivered. I have heard that the machine is not actually in existence, that one was made in Germany, imported to Montreal, Canada, and there it developed so many defects it had to be returned for redesign, that no one knows whether the new machine will prove effective or not.

"If this is the issue that is holding up the settlement of the strike, if the Journal is not interested in this machine, how does it happen that the Journal lends itself to this issue? This is a fair question, I think, and one which ought to be answered, but how are we to find the answer? How are we to get it?

"Featherbedding is a real problem and will become more acute as automation increases. Its solution does not lie in strikes or lockout, but in statesmanship.

"I have heard it rumored that the Oregonian does not want to settle the strike until its insurance strike benefits run out, by which time it hopes to have brought the Journal and the unions to their knees. The benefits, by the way, make it possible, I am told, to pay strikers $200 a week. Is it true?

"The newspapers must be cognizant of these rumors, but they have not affirmed or denied them.

"I have heard it rumored that the Oregonian and the Journal are out to 'bust the unions,' that they are insisting upon an 'open shop' from reporters to pressmen. If these rumors are true (and I do not say they are true because I do not know) they ought to be matters of public concern.

"With the consolidation of newspapers that is taking place all over the country—and the Newhouse interests are playing a major part in these consolidations—the labor market for those whose only skills are in newspaper work is being diminished. Thus in an open shop, the wage scale is apt to be depressed for there are an increasing number of applicants for every job, and the law of supply and demand when not protected by unionism, works just as well in the labor market as it does in the marts of trade.

"Indeed, one of the tragic consequences of the present controversy is the job uncertainty of the men and women who have dedicated their lives to the profession of journalism and who have given to the city of Portland high examples of professional competency as reporters, some of them winning national awards for their work.

"Indeed, the Pultizer Prize, which the Oregonian boasts of, was won for them by guild members who are now uncertain as to the future of their jobs."

Dr. Steiner noted the publishers' charge that by respecting the picket lines and staying off their jobs, members of the Newspaper Guild and the craft unions have broken their contracts. "This may be true," he said, "but, if it is true, the newspapers have recourse to the courts under the Taft-Hartley law for damages. So far, I have heard of no threat of such suit.

"Surely the newspaper publishers are not so naive as to believe that those who owe so much to their unions would cross a picket line. The union movement is based on solidarity. If unions don't hang together, they shall surely hang separately to quote a much honored and revered Revolutionary leader."

In conclusion Dr. Steiner declared that the responsibility both of the unions and of the publishers in the present controversy is of concern to the public "and we ought to make known our concern to those who have accepted the responsibility to keep us informed."

[From the Guild Reporter, Washington, D.C., Dec. 11, 1959]

PORTLAND PAPERS CUT OFF GUILD BLUE CROSS PROGRAM

PORTLAND, OREG.—The Oregonian and the Oregon Journal are squeezing guild members in a frantic attempt to force them back to work across the picket lines of striking stereotypers.

First step in the squeeze was an announcement by the papers Friday, December 4, that guild members and their families would be cut off from Blue Cross coverage under the plans at the two dailies.

Management rejected a proposal by the Portland Guild that the health and welfare trust be continued and coverage maintained, with premiums to be deducted from salaries when the strike is over.

The guild promptly reached agreement with Blue Cross to establish a new interim hospitalization and surgical plan for its members, identical in both benefits and costs with previous coverage at the Oregonian and the Journal.

The plan adds a $13 a month premium for each member to the financial burden during the strike. The cost to the local, with some 160 members out, will be more than $2,000 a month over and above routine operating costs and regular benefits for members and dependents.

If Blue Cross coverage had been allowed to lapse, however, maternity benefits would have been lost for the wives of several guildsmen because of interrupted membership.

The two papers followed up the welfare cutoff with a series of weekend telephone calls and letters seeking to induce guild members to return to work. The messages were made up of veiled threats, promises, and plain pleading. There were no defectors.

Guild units at both papers have been honoring the stereotypers' picket lines since the strike began, November 5. Printers, pressmen, mailers, engravers, and other crafts also have refused to work during the strike. ITU members joined the picket line when they found the plant doors locked and guarded against them and their positions filled by strikebreakers on the first day of the walkout.

With the help of the strikebreakers, plus supervisors and other nonunion personnel, the Oregonian and the Journal have managed to publish a combined daily edition under the flags of both papers. The plant and equipment of S. I. Newhouse's Oregonian are being used to produce the hybrid.

Despite a claimed press run of more than 500,000 and more than 5 weeks of operation, the combination paper still is little more than a throwaway. Circulation is haphazard. Carriers report mounting losses. Advertising space is rationed and a growing number of merchants have switched to spot television and radio commercials.

A telephone poll of Portland residents by guild members, using scientific polling

methods, revealed that some 15 percent of the papers' readers have canceled their subscriptions. Losses in the suburban and State areas, where circulation has been cut most sharply, may send the cancellation total to 20 percent, the pollsters estimate.

The cancellation campaign picked up momentum after the first of the month. Many residents had been reluctant to inflict losses on carrier boys by stopping delivery in mid-November.

Advertisers, too, are rejecting even rationed space in the face of the rate policy adopted by the Oregonian-Journal. For space in the combined paper, the advertiser pays twice—once to the Oregonian and once to the Journal.

Within the past 2 weeks, management's stand on two of the key issues in the strike appeared ludicrous in the light of developments elsewhere.

The Oregonian has insisted that the stereotypers agree only one man will be necessary to operate a new German plate-casting machine it has not even ordered yet and which is not yet in use anywhere in the country.

On November 27, the union reached agreement on the same question with all three Detroit newspapers under substantially the same terms it has offered the Oregonian: that the manning issue will be negotiated by the parties when and if the machine is installed and both sides have had a chance to see it in operation.

The Portland papers also insist they will sign no union contracts under which foremen remain members of the union, on the gounds that this creates a closed shop in violation of the Taft-Hartley Act.

That question, too, was settled in Detroit by leaving the choice of membership to the individual.

And on November 25, the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C., ruled that a contract is not necessarily an illegal closed shop just because the foreman is a member of the union.

The unions also turned up new evidence that the strike was deliberately provoked by management in an attempt to turn the plants into open shops in all departments.

Two visitors to Portland reported they had met one of the strikebreakers now in the city—James Younger, of Fort Smith, Ark.—in Reno, Nev., last spring and summer. They said that on hearing they would be in Portland later in the year, Younger replied: "We'll see you in Portland."

The names and origins of more than 70 of the strikebreakers were printed in the Oregon Labor Press, a weekly owned by 11 AFL–CIO unions and councils in the State. Several of the scabs were identified as recruits of Bloor Schleppey and Shirley Klein in other newspaper strikebreaking attempts around the country.

Part of the list was read to the public by Guild President Bob Shults on a half-hour TV program produced by the Inter-Strike Policy Committee, headed by Charles Dale, ANG international representative.

The program, which aroused a storm of comment in the community, featured a series of interviews with union officials, rank-and-file picketers, and strikers' wives. It was the third half-hour TV program sponsored by the committee since the start of the dispute. The policy committee also is sponsoring 10 5-minute news broadcasts a week, divided between two radio stations.

Preparation of the newscasts and other publicity and public relations material is being carried out by guild members. The local is continuing, too, the production and distribution of handbills and its work with the Inter-Union Speakers' Bureau. Local President Shults already has addressed student and faculty groups at three of Portland's four colleges.

One temporary setback—the loss of its interim headquarters—was met and overcome by the local. The guild was evicted from a vacant store it had rented on Southwest Broadway just before a wrecking crew demolished the building to make way for a new 23-story Hilton hotel. The local's new headquarters consists of a second-floor suite of offices formerly occupied by a firm of labor attorneys.

[From the Guild Reporter, Washington, D.C., Dec. 25, 1959]

OREGON STRIKEBREAKER—PROBE SET—STATE GROUP ORDERS STUDY OF SCAB USE

PORTLAND, OREG.—The stereotypers' strike against Portland's two daily newspapers rolled into the sixth week with developments on every front except the bargaining table.

Management suffered two setbacks during the week.

The Oregon Legislative Interim Committee on Labor Management Relations ordered a special investigation January 9 on the use of imported strikebreakers and their effect on collective bargaining. The motion clearly aimed at the Portland newspaper strike was passed unanimously.

Unions were on hand for the committee's session in the State capital at Salem. They were prepared to introduce evidence on organized strikebreaking. The committee, however, preferred to call a special session to hear the explosive testimony.

The Oregon Wage and Hour Commission was advised at its regular meeting that women teletypesetter operators were being worked 72 hours per week in order to produce the combined Oregonian-Oregon Journal at the Oregonian plant.

The commission voted 2 to 1 to order the companies to obey State law in limiting the workweek to 44 hours for women employees. The commission also noted that under this law women may be worked a maximum of 60 hours under emergency conditions.

Both events received extensive radio and TV coverage. The strike newspaper, called the Orejournal by those on the picket lines, gave the stories the "kissed off" news treatment. But management trumpeted on the front page the return to work of eight guildsmen on December 14. Several others trickled back to work during the week, bringing to 14 the number of defectors from the guild's ranks.

The group included several leaders of a back-to-work movement launched the week before. This issue was met head-on at a membership meeting of the local. After 2 hours of debate, the back-to-work motion was resoundingly defeated 117 to 23 by secret written ballot. The night before the strike started the local voted 68 to 30, also by secret ballot, to respect the picket line.

Bob Shults, PNG president, said he and other guildsmen had the highest respect for others in the back-to-work movement who continue to observe the picket line. "We are proud that they are honoring the rights of others by obeying the mandate of the majority as recorded by a secret ballot," he said.

When the first seven defectors arrived at the Oregonian plant they found a mass picket line of 125 persons. Radio and TV were on the scene to cover the incident.

One radio station's news director handed a microphone to Shults on the sidewalk and asked what effect the defections would have on the morale of the guild. Shults replied:

"The guild is a thinking man's union, a few members just filtered through the picket line."

The remark was widely quoted and tape recordings of the live broadcast were repeated on subsequent news programs.

Publishers of the Oregonian and the Journal have flatly refused to accept mediation through Gov. Mark Hatfield or through an impartial factfinding panel as suggested by both the Governor and Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.

More than 3 weeks ago, the Portland newspaper unions accepted the Governor's offer of personal mediation, but the publishers would have no part of it.

This week, Senator NEUBERGER suggested that the Governor appoint "a citizen's factfinding panel of the utmost impartiality and integrity to help clarify the issues in the present Portland newspaper strike."

Again the unions agreed, but the publishers brushed aside the suggestion.

The Portland Guild represents the newsrooms of the two papers and inside circulation at the Journal.

For the first month of the strike management had let it be known that any guildsman would have to be rehired to get his job back. After the solid 5-to-1 vote to defeat the back-to-work movement management launched a whirlwind campaign at "weak sisters" with the offer that they could go back to work just as if they had never missed a day on the job.

Honey works where vinegar did not, management found out.

The defectors leaped from the frying pan to the fire as far as their hospital and life insurance plan is concerned. They can't work enough shifts in December to be covered in January under the joint guild-management trust fund and most certainly the hard-pressed guild treasury is not going to pay the $15.80 per person bill for them.

"Instead of declaring supplementary local benefits for members from the generous donations of other guilds we are paying the hospital and life insurance for all guildsmen respecting the picket line," Shults explained. This cost PNG almost $2,400 for December coverage. The local faces a $2,200 bill for January coverage for its 130 members still off their jobs.

The plan provides either Blue Cross or Kaiser Permanente hospital and surgical coverage and $4,000 life insurance.

Management apparently was stung by the latest in a series of TV shows sponsored by the newspaper unions. The newspapers reprinted the speeches of the four panel members and then denounced them in two columns of 12-point type. It took a full page of space.

The bitterest and longest blasts in the editorial were directed at Charles Dale, guild international representative assigned to Portland for the strike emergency. Dale had blistered management for the importation of 115 professional strike breakers into its mechanical departments. The TV shows have been hurting management as they urge the public to cancel their subscriptions.

One nonunion telephone operator said "The switchboard lights up like a Christmas tree the instant the program is over and continues that way for several hours as people cancel their papers."

Careful investigation shows the combined paper is down more than 100,000 in circulation. Advertisers, however, are charged the regular rates by both papers for rationed ads appearing in the combined edition.

The weekly Oregon Labor Press, in carrying the union story to Portland's citizenry, pushed up the press run of its December 18 issue to 100,000.

Planned for the year-end is an edition of 275,000, to be mailed to virtually every residence in the Portland metropolitan area. The eight-page issue will eliminate all advertising and regular features and will tell the Portland strike story from its beginning. Six striking editorial staff members, plus artists and photographers on assignment, will aid editor Jim Goodsell in production. Locked-out ITU mailers have volunteered to work over the Christmas weekend to get the paper into the mails.

The stereotypers are on strike at Portland. The ITU printers and mailers are on the picket lines carrying lockout banners. Pressmen, engravers, machinists, and members of other unions are respecting the picket lines. Teamsters employed by the Journal are also on the picket line.

[From the Oregon Labor Press, Dec. 25, 1959]

THE NEWSPAPER STRIKE STORY: THERE IS ANOTHER SIDE—EMPLOYEES ASK ONLY THEIR DAY IN COURT

This is an appeal to your sense of fair play.

It is the story—spread across this special issue of the Oregon Labor Press—of a newspaper strike in Portland.

The publishers have described their version of the dispute as the facts. Their union employees believe that these facts are biased, slanted, and in some cases, outright untruths.

Here is the employees' side. Openly and honestly, they say it is their side. It is a side which has not, unfortunately, been told by the publishers of the Oregonian and Oregon Journal.

We ask only that you read—and then decide where the truth is to be found.

The present newspaper strike is not an ordinary labor dispute. It is not over wages. It is not over any clear-cut issue. There has not been good faith bargaining by the publishers to settle it.

In short, we believe this is an employer-forced strike.

We believe it was provoked, deliberately, by the publishers of the Oregonian and Oregon Journal to destroy unions—unions whose members are your friends and neighbors in every part of the Portland area.

We say this for several compelling reasons:

1. A Republican Governor, Mark Hatfield, offered to mediate a settlement of the strike. He was urged to do so by both the Portland and the Oregon Council of Churches.

The Governor agreed. The unions agreed. The publishers flatly refused.

A Democratic U.S. Senator, RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, urged the appointment of a citizens' factfinding committee to clarify the strike issues for the public.

The unions welcomed the suggestion. The publishers flatly refused.

(Both newspapers, over the years, have praised Oregon Governors for mediating labor disputes. They have recommended factfinding as a method of settling strikes. But now the publishers reject these remedies in their own strike. We can only conclude that they don't want to settle this strike—and they don't want the public to know the facts.)

2. Every strike issue labeled as a "key issue" by the Portland publishers also was an issue in Detroit recently. In Detroit, each of these issues was settled without a strike, without months of negotiation, without bitterness.

In 7 hours of good faith bargaining, these issues were settled by Detroit's three major newspapers and the Stereotypers' Union—on terms to which Portland's striking stereotypers would agree this very minute.

Every issue settled—in 7 hours. They were not settled here, we believe, because the Portland publishers wanted this strike.

3. The Stereotypers' Union has offered many compromises and concessions, both before and after the strike began. But the Oregonian and Journal have met each compromise with a new and tougher demand.

We believe this proves that the publishers wanted the strike—and that now they want it to continue. How different from the 7-hour settlement of the same issues in Detroit. How different from the peaceful negotiation of new union contracts by both daily newspapers in our sister city of Seattle.

4. The Oregonian and Journal have continued to publish a joint newspaper by the wholesale importing of professional strikebreakers—most of them from the Deep South and other far-away States.

Many among the 116 identified strikebreakers have police records. Several of them came armed—at least one with an illegal sawed-off shotgun. All break strikes for salaries—premium salaries ranging to $300 a week plus expenses.

Several of these strikebreakers knew as long as 5 months ago that they were going to be needed in Portland this year. They were alerted long before the Stereotypers Union had even opened negotiations with the Oregonian and Journal publishers.

5. Strike insurance, a new device in labor relations, has enabled the Portland publishers to import their strikebreakers. Strike insurance is the reason why they defiantly refuse the proferred help of the Governor, why they defiantly refuse to bargain in good faith with the unions of their longtime employees.

Strike insurance means the Oregonian and Journal are collecting $1 million over a 50-day period—from a multi-million-dollar insurance account held in a Canadian bank.

This not only means that the publishers' losses are being covered.

What is far more important is that for the 8 weeks, while the employees try to scrimp along, there is absolutely no pressure on the publishers to negotiate for a settlement of the strike.

As in the old bloody days of raw capitalism, management can try—literally—to starve out its employees, while it loses not a cent. This is a strange situation for placid Portland and its once-venerated hometown newspapers.

6. This is a dispute which threatens to make Portland a one-newspaper city.

New York press lord Samuel I. Newhouse, who owns the Oregonian, wants the locally owned Journal.

If he gets it, he can save millions by merger.

If he gets it, we can expect the same kind of objectivity on all subjects that the hybrid Oregonian-Journal has provided on the news of this strike. Would we have newspapers or viewspapers?

HIGHER PRICES COULD RESULT

If Newhouse buys the Journal, watch prices climb; newspaper merger everywhere has meant higher advertising rates—and hence higher prices on the food and merchandise you buy.

Tragically, this strike never would have started if the publishers had shown good faith in bargaining or shown the slightest desire for honest negotiation of a labor contract.

But the Oregonian and Journal still profess to believe in collective bargaining. In rejecting Senator NEUBERGER'S factfinding proposal, they called collective bargaining the "proper procedure for settlement of such disputes."

In this dispute, the publishers have made a mockery of their own words. They have raised demands which no union in America could accept—wholesale elimination of union rights won in years of honest collective bargaining.

Check the progress on the issues:

Issue No. 1

Publishers originally demanded one-man operation of a German-made plate-casting machine which they haven't even ordered and which the stereotypers have never seen. They haven't seen it because there isn't a single one in operation in the United States.

Stereotypers offered to negotiate the number of men needed to run the machine when and if it was installed. As a further concession, they agreed to no work stoppage or strike during the progress of such negotiation.

The publishers refused the offer. Instead, they added a new demand—reexamination of the manning of other equipment—a question already settled by the collective bargaining procedure the publishers say they admire.

And, incidentally, the Journal has no interest in the machine. Why does the Journal support the Oregonian's adamant stand on an issue that means nothing to the Journal?

Issue No. 2

Publishers demanded the right to hire substitutes, which the union always has provided. Publishers said this system has forced hiring of men at overtime rates.

The stereotypers offered to settle this point by covering all regular shifts at straight-time rates and to guarantee no penalty shifts.

The publishers refused. Instead, they again added a new demand—that strikebreakers be given priority and seniority over regular employees of long standing.

Issue No. 3

Publishers demanded that foremen decide for themselves whether to belong to a union.

The stereotypers agreed.

Box score on the three issues:

The stereotypers: three issues, three concessions, no new demands.

The publishers: three issues, no concessions, five new demands.

In addition to the two mentioned, they insist on the following:

1. A 5-hour increase in the workweek, with no increase in pay.

2. An open shop, which would force union men to work side by side with strikebreakers.

3. A no strike clause in any new contract.

This is the type of collective bargaining that has caused the publishers to resist appointment of an impartial factfinding body.

This is the way management serves 850 employees, many of 20 and 30 years' service and whose loyalty would not permit them to walk out on mere whim or caprice.

ENTIRE COMMUNITY HURT

But this strike hurts not only the jobless employees.

It hurts merchants—because of restricted advertising sold at premium rates, because of the decreased spending power in the community. Strikebreakers take their money back to Dixie.

It hurts readers—because of an inferior product with scant local news, because they have grounds now to be distrustful of all objective news the papers may print.

It hurts the community—because if monopoly should result, Portland will be a city with one advertising rate and one voice—from which there would be virtually no appeal.

Documentation of the arguments we make here is detailed throughout this special issue of the Oregon Labor Press.

Read it and decide who merits your support—850 longtime citizens of our community who have made honest attempts and concessions in an effort to end the strike—or Newhouse and the professional strikebreakers he has imported from the South to destroy the unions to which your friends and neighbors belong.

THOSE NEW "OREGONIANS"—ROVING STRIKEBREAKERS SUPPLANT PORTLANDERS

"All are good people, most of them married, a large percent owning their own homes and paying Oregon taxes."

The words are those of the Oregonian-Journal, used to describe the personnel now putting out the combined paper.

They sound reassuring. Except for one thing.

They aren't true.

Already, the Labor Press has published documented rosters of 116 professional strikebreakers imported by the publishers.

Some were here within hours after the strike began—even though their homes are thousands of miles away. Others said, as long as 5 months ago, that they expected to be in Portland this year.

Take William Glover for example.

He is married—to Justine Glover, who has been associated with him in strikebreaking attempts across the country, including this one.

He may own a home—but it is not in Portland. And if he pays Oregon taxes, it is only because he has to through payroll deductions.

Glover, 34, known as "Bino" to his fellow strikebreakers, has worked for the Schleppey-Klein firm, an organization dedicated to breaking strikes—temporarily seizing, for exorbitant pay, the jobs of regular employees out on strike.

Before coming to Portland just after the present dispute began November 10, Glover was involved as a strikebreaker in Zanesville, Ohio; Houston; Ypsilanti, Mich.; Haverhill, Mass., and Westchester County, N.Y.

Compare him, for example, to Fred Breckon, one of the regular newspaper employees, whose jobs the strikebreakers have pirated.

Breckon is a soft-spoken printer who has worked at the Oregon Journal for 12 years.

He is proud of his home in Vermont Hills, a home into which he has welcomed this year a Mexican exchange student.

Fred Breckon votes and pays Oregon taxes, but he also does a host of things in the community which are not required of him:

He was one of the first volunteer workers at the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry. He is a member of the Men's Garden Club, a Mason, a radio ham, a member of the First Presbyterian Church.

His wife, Lillian, is a past president of the Portland PTA council and a State board member. She is on the YWCA board.

They managed to send their oldest son, Lyall, to Harvard, and now he works for the State Department. Their other son, Garry, is a Wilson High sophomore.

The Breckons now get the bare minimum strike benefits provided by the International Typographical Union. The Glovers, on the other hand, together make close to $700 a week, for their part in trying to break a legitimate strike.

This kind of activity has come under official scrutiny several times. In Westchester County, N.Y., for example, a New York State legislative committee denounced the existence of a strikebreaker pool.

A similar probe has been undertaken in Pennsylvania. Now, in Portland, the urgings of responsible public officials have resulted in the scheduling of an investigation by the legislative interim committee on labor-management relations.

The investigations come simply because these people are strikebreakers, who, by their existence, the New York committee concluded, incite labor strife by encouraging publishers to force regular employees, good people, out on strike.

Missing Bylines—Famous Reporters Honor Picket Line

Missing these days from Portland's two daily newspapers are the bylines of reporters whose years of dedicated service have won them a proud place in American newspaper history.

These are the bylines of members of the American Newspaper Guild, members who have voted overwhelmingly to support their fellow unions in the strike against the Oregonian and Oregon Journal.

They are bylines which have earned Portland a national reputation for honesty and impartiality in reporting.

The men and women supporting this strike have won, individually or for their papers, almost every major honor in American journalism—the Pulitzer Prize, the Heywood Broun Award, Nieman fellowships, national recognition for reporting in the fields of government, education, traffic safety, and aviation.

Nieman fellowships, incidentally, provide graduate study at Harvard University for America's outstanding newspapermen and newspaperwomen.

Supporting this strike are news reporters you know:

Wallace Turner, Oregonian, winner of two Heywood Broun Awards (for his exposure of scandal in sale of Indian lands and for investigation of vice), Nieman fellow, major contributor to the winning of a Pulitzer Prize.

Donald J. Sterling, Jr., Journal, Nieman fellow whose reporting of city government and of other stories have won him widespread respect for impartiality, for accuracy.

Wilma Morrison, Oregonian, one of America's top education reporters, twice winner of the National Education Writers Association's top award, only noneducator ever appointed to the educational policy committee of the NEA and former Oregon Education Citizen of the Year.

Stan Weber, Journal, whose down-the-middle coverage of labor disputes has earned him respect of both management and labor in a field as explosive as any covered by newspapers.

Mervin Shoemaker, Oregonian, veteran political writer, whose views are sought by national magazines.

Stan Durland, Journal, whose authoritative reporting of medical affairs has gained him the confidence of both the medical profession and the reading public.

Leverett Richards, Oregonian, national authority in the aviation field (he flies jets himself), public information officer for the Antarctic Operation Deep Freeze in 1956 and 1957, and 1957 winner of the Junior Chamber of Commerce Award for outstanding contribution to aviation in Portland.

J. Edward Reid, Journal, national award winner for his crime reporting, trusted associate of FBI agents and other top police investigators.

Paul Hauser, Oregonian, veteran of the political arena, even better known for his human interest stories which for years have drawn both tears and laughter from his readers.

John Finch, Journal, whose coverage of the waterfront has kept readers both entertained and informed on vital activities in a major shipping center.

These are but a few of the bylines missing from the hybrid newspaper now being printed by imported strikebreakers in our city.

And the reporters are not alone in the Newspaper Guild in their support of other unions.

With them are sports writers who have covered championship fights, Rose Bowl and East-West games, national basketball championships, national golf tournaments.

With them are the society editors and writers—at ease at Portland's most exclusive parties, in the most exclusive clubs—yet now supporting a newspaper strike and lockout, lending a hand in union activities.

With them are photographers, risking injury one minute at floods and fires, the next quietly photographing teenagers who win leads in senior class plays.

With them are women in the newspapers' home service departments, women who answer frantic young brides' requests for instructions on cooking elk steaks.

With them are garden experts who save your roses with proper pruning instructions.

With them are artists whose cartoons can infuriate or tickle, whose deft touches save faded photographs brought in for reproduction.

These are the men and women of the Portland Newspaper Guild.

They are homeowners, active in civic affairs, proud of their city.

They are proud of their role in American life.

They are also proud of their union.

Strikebreaking Probe Slated by Legislators

The importation of strikebreakers and its impact on labor-management relations in Oregon will be aired at a public hearing scheduled in Salem January 9 by the Legislative Interim Committee on Labor-Management Relations.

Although the decision to conduct such a hearing obviously grew out of the current newspaper strike, in which the combined Oregonian-Oregon Journal is being published by imported strikebreakers, the committee has announced that the matter will be considered in the light of the overall labor-management relations picture in the State.

Decision to call the hearing was reached unanimously by the committee at a meeting in Salem December 18 on the motion of Walter J. Pearson, senate president, who is a member of the group.

Initial request for just such a hearing was made by State Representative Edward J. Whelan, another committee member and executive-secretary of the Multnomah County Central Labor Council.

Representatives of the two struck newspapers and the unions involved in the strike-lockout will be invited to testify at the hearing, but no attempt will be made by the committee to consider the issues of the strike itself. It was emphasized that the hearing will be confined to the single matter of importation of strikebreakers.

George Brown, political education director for the Oregon AFL–CIO, also was in attendance at the December 18 meeting and urged the committee to confine its hearing to the one problem, without going into the strike issues.

Whelan originally proposed that the committee take up the matter of strikebreakers when it became apparent within the first week of the strike that the combined newspapers were importing strikebreakers from as far away as Florida.

Whelan viewed the practice of importing strikebreakers as having a "serious negative impact on the efforts of mediation."

Provocations Resisted—Attacks, Threats Harass Pickets

They have been attacked with cars, bottles, and baseball-size rocks.

They have been threatened with sawed-off shotguns, rifles, and late-night phone calls.

But, nonetheless, the pickets and other union members involved in the present newspaper strike have not let themselves be provoked.

A survey of the thick police bureau file on the strike disclosed that incidents of violence or near-violence concerning the strike, by and large, were not caused by the union side.

The first report in the police file, dated November 15, is probably also the most menacing.

Patrolmen Louis De Giovanni and Bernard Schuette stopped two men leaving a Florida-licensed car across Southwest Columbia Street from the Oregonian plant—where the struck managements are publishing jointly.

The men, Gordon Comstock, 27, and Franklin E. Early, 22, were carrying an armload of weapons. The men said they had been hired by the Oregonian.

The officers' report described the weapons as a .22 Winchester, a 12-gage Savage, a .22

Higgins—and a sawed-off shotgun, "homemade and without markings of any kind."

The gun, in clear violation of Federal law, was seized by the FBI, and the Federal Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Unit investigated.

The combined newspaper reported the incident without any mention of the sawed-off shotgun or the FBI's role.

Despite the notoriety this caused, a similar incident occurred 4 weeks later, when weapons were taken from three other imported strikebreakers—Curtis Gleason, Holden, Mass.; Richard C. Brewster, Oxford, Mass., and an unidentified third man.

On December 11, police arrested paper distributor Wilford P. Weller, 520 Northeast Laurelhurst Street, after he plowed his car into a group of women pickets.

Four women were struck, and Arleta Johnson, 27, 5423, Southeast Gladstone Street, was hospitalized.

Patrolman Bernard K. Smith said Weller was so belligerent that "I had to go over his hood to get to the driver's side and get the car stopped."

A more serious incident on November 19 sent printer Ira Connell, 55, 9570 Southwest 80th Avenue, to Emanuel Hospital with painful hip and ankle injuries.

Connell was not picketing but was talking to a friend on the picket line when he was struck by a newspaper-filled station wagon.

Connell's wife, a witness, said the vehicle didn't stop, but "just shot right out of the tunnel."

On December 14, picket Eugene K. Wootten, 14745 Southeast Rhone Street, walking in front of the empty Journal Building, just missed being struck by large rocks thrown from an upstairs window.

At least two union families have been threatened with violence, by a smooth-talking woman familiar with their jobs.

There have been a few incidents on the other side of the fence.

The most serious ended December 11 when two former Journal truckdrivers were convicted of assault and battery in Milwaukee justice court and fined $75 each.

Present Journal distributors George A. Fleming and Elmer Betts testified they had been struck several times with lengths of rubber hose after the former drivers, Mike Rovito and Claude Mayo, followed them to Oak Grove from the Oregonian.

On November 15, Henry D. Keith, 32, 910 Southeast 175th Avenue, identified as a pressman, was arrested for drunkenness and jaywalking in connection with an attempt to spill papers.

STRIKEBREAKER KNEW HE WAS COMING—FIVE MONTHS AGO IN RENO BAR: "WE'LL BREAK A PORTLAND STRIKE"

Five months ago, the publishers of the Oregonian and Oregon Journal already were planning to force a strike and to import professional strikebreakers.

That is the conclusion of two Portland telephone operators who were told by a newspaper strikebreaker in Reno last summer:

"We'll be coming up to Portland this year * * * we'll all be up there."

This week, the two women gave the first detailed public account of their encounter with newspaper strikebreakers, asking only that their names be withheld.

The scene: The cocktail bar of the Carlton Hotel in Reno, Nevada.

The time: The evening of July 11, 1959.

"I had been playing a machine," says one of the women, "when this man spoke to me. We got to talking and he said he was a strikebreaker.

"I didn't even want to talk to him then—a strikebreaker is the most despicable thing I can imagine, but my friend said she didn't even know what a strikebreaker was."

The man, now identified as James Younger, of Fort Smith, Ark., was then working behind the picket line at the Reno Gazette and Journal. He is now working behind the picket line at the Oregonian building.

In the Reno cocktail bar, Younger explained that he got $250 a week counting overtime, $6 a day for meals, and his hotel bills and transportation taken care of.

"I go wherever the money is," he said.

By this time, the husbands of the two women had returned "and we got to talking some more with this fellow—he was the only clean-cut looking one in the bunch—and four or five other people who worked with him.

"They said they were breaking the strike at the Reno paper and were bragging all about how much money they were making.

"We told them we were from Portland.

"'Say,' this one fellow said, 'we'll be coming up to Portland this year.'

"'Oh, don't be ridiculous,' I said," the woman recalls.

"'Well, we will be. We'll all be up there.'"

The other Portland woman's account of the incident is almost the same.

She recalls that a woman strikebreaker was creating a raucous scene at the bar. This woman, about 45, talked as though she were a leader of the strikebreakers.

"She said that by the end of the month, she would have earned $1,000," the young Portland woman relates.

"She told me where the next newspaper strike was expected, and said, 'I'm going to be there. I'm going to be in the middle of it.'

"I asked her how she knew.

"'Oh, our association always knows that,'" the woman replied.

After their return to Portland several days later, the women reported the incident to their union head, Wesley D. McDuffee, president of Local 9201, Communication Workers of America, who confirms their story.

"They were quite shocked about this strikebreaking situation in Reno," McDuffee said this week. "Very frankly, I didn't think much of it at the time. But I changed my mind when the strike started in Portland—and especially when Younger showed up here."

The women also asked an Oregonian reporter, long-time friend of one, about the likelihood of a strike.

"He laughed," the woman recalls. "He said there wasn't even talk of a strike."

And indeed there wasn't—by the unions. For all this took place 4 months before the strike began and 2 months before Stereotypers Local 48 even sat down to open negotiations with the Portland publishers.

But today, just as he said he would be, James Younger is 1 of the 116 identified strikebreakers working at the Oregonian plant.

PUBLISHERS IMPORT 116 STRIKEBREAKERS

A pool of professional strikebreakers is available on immediate call in the newspaper industry.

Each newspaper strikebreaking operation provides a training ground for new strikebreakers.

Now they are in Portland. They are working at the Oregonian building putting out the hybrid Oregonian-Oregon Journal, getting premium pay and all expenses.

They arrived from as far away as Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, and Florida, many on the first day of the strike.

Chief of the imported strikebreaking crew is L. R. McCoy, fresh from a similar assignment in Galveston, Tex. He was sent here by the Southwest Newspaper Publishers' Association, an affiliate of the national association.

Working here under him are a number of alumni of the Schleppey-Klein operation.

Organized by Bloor Schleppey of Zionsville, Ind., self-avowed paid strikebreaker for the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, the operation has trained printers, pressmen, and stereotypers to pirate the jobs of regular workers.

Schleppey has been a frequent speaker at ANPA conventions and his services have been used in dozens of strikebreaking attempts.

It cannot we determined if he or his associate, Shirley Klein, are involved here directly. But their students are here.

They are people like David B. Anderson, 23, whose home address is unknown, but who hasn't spent much time there lately in any case. He has worked as a Schleppey-Klein strikebreaker in Davenport, Iowa; Chicago, Miami, and Haverhill, Mass.

Or Betsy Coxe, a blonde teletypesetter instructor who is known to have worked as a strikebreaker in Miami and Oklahoma City.

Or Lee Norton, whose job-pirating history includes episodes in Galveston, Tex., Monroe, La., and Wichita Falls, Tex.

Their names have been detailed before. The Labor Press has listed the roster of 116 imported roving job stealers.

Whose jobs have they taken?

Harold Warner has spent 54 of his 68 years working for first the Journal and then the Oregonian.

"We helped build the Journal," he says with pride. "If the Jacksons or the Pittocks were around now, this kind of strike would never have happened."

His is a two-generation Oregonian family. Son George, 32, already has worked at the Oregonian for 9 years. Both Warners are substantial citizens. They own homes. They are active in youth work and other community activities. They pay taxes for and take pride in their neighborhoods and city.

In his 29 years as a pressman in Portland, John Bisch has been a leader in his union, a school district chairman, a civil defense official, and an active Mason.

Petite Freda Cowling, club editor of the Oregonian for more than 30 years, has spent countless hours working for the Red Cross, the United Fund, the Visiting Nurse Association, and the Air Defense Filter Center.

She has given blood 35 times at the Red Cross blood center.

Mrs. Cowling, who, like other members of the Newspaper Guild, decided not to cross the picket lines into the struck newspaper plant, is a church and precinct board member, buying a home and paying local taxes.

Who is more valuable to the community, Freda Cowling or Betsy Coxe?

The story can be repeated again and again—as many times as there are strikebreakers to compare with regular newspaper employees—solid citizens of Portland.

A few are detailed with pictures on this page. Compare the records—and then decide whose side you'd like to be on.

ONE-NEWSPAPER TOWN?—THREAT OF MERGER FACING PORTLAND

Repeated denials by Journal owners have failed to erase the threat posed by the newspaper strike-lockout that Portland will wind up in the ranks of one-newspaper cities.

Samuel I. Newhouse, the New York press lord who owns the Oregonian, wants to buy the Journal. Already the Journal has fallen to a "kept" status in the Oregonian building.

The Journal management's denial that the paper is for sale comes as no surprise. All newspaper consolidations are preceded routinely by similar firm denials.

Actions of Journal publishers, however, weaken their denials. The day the strike commenced, the Journal management closed its own plant and transferred operations to the plant of its competitor, the Oregonian.

Further, the Journal management admitted it had no interest in the German platecasting machine, operation of which the Oregonian posed as the primary issue which led to the strike-lockout.

One Journal official said privatey early in the strike:

"This situation means the windup of the Journal and the windup of me. The Oregonian is going to take us over when this strike is done."

Missing is any denial on the part of the Oregonian management that Newhouse interests want to purchase the Journal. Elsewhere, Newhouse has been successful in buying out his competitors in the newspaper field.

Newspaper consolidation and monopoly control have been progressively increasing in recent years. The consequences of such mergers are manifold, and of growing concern to the public.

What might one newspaper mean to Portland?

It would mean increased subscription rates. It could mean increased advertising rates which would be passed on to the consumer through increased prices of merchandise.

Of more significance to the public generally might be the editorial implications of a monopoly operation. It could mean concentration of all editorial power in one newspaper and quite possibly in one man.

It could mean the establishment of a policy which could create a blackout of all but one side of any issue.

Louis M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University, views the newspaper consolidation trend in this way:

"As mergers increase and more and more cities are reduced to a single newspaper ownership, the danger that the newspaper will become chiefly a voice of the local power setup increases.

"As this concentration proceeds, what form of countervailing power is available to the elements in the community which do not feel their interests affiliated with the elements of local power?

"In short, what chance for those who do not feel represented by the board of trade?"

STRIKE INSURANCE: $1 MILLION ACE IN HOLE—PORTLAND PAPERS USE NEW WEAPON

Strike insurance.

This is the ace in the hole held by strikebreaking publishers of the Oregonian and Journal.

A strike insurance war chest of more than $17 million is held in a Montreal, Canada, bank. It is out of reach of U.S. courts and laws.

It can pay the Portland publishers up to $1 million in the present strike lockout.

Each of them can collect $10,000 per day, up to $500,000, over a 50-day period.

Premium payments are deductible as a business expense for tax purposes.

Strike insurance is the device that enabled the publishers to bring in a flying squad of strikebreakers. These strikebreakers, some of them armed and some with police records, are here to put down a legitimate effort of Portland newspaper unions to bargain collectively for fair and decent working conditions and wages.

NEWHOUSE LEADS DEVELOPMENT

Strike insurance is a potent new weapon for union busting. It has been pioneered by the American Newspaper Publishers' Association.

Spearheading its development within the newspaper industry is Samuel Newhouse of New York, absentee owner of the Oregonian.

Two representatives of the Newhouse newspaper chain are on the Newspaper Publishing Premium Fund Committee of the strike insurance plan. They are Theodore Newhouse and M. J. Frey.

Theodore Newhouse is Sam Newhouse's brother. He is general manager of the Long Island Press and Star-Journal. Although he is a resident of New York, he is also vice-president of the Oregonian Publishing Co.

M. J. Frey is publisher of the Oregonian.

Presence of two Newhouse men on the strike insurance committee is all the proof needed that the Oregonian is covered. Statements that the Oregon Journal also participates in the union-busting insurance plan have brought no denials from Journal publishers.

One reason why the publishers' strike insurance is held in Canada is that in 1956 the filing of such policies in New York was rejected by that State's department of insurance as contrary to public policy.

PLAN MOVED TO CANADA

The New York State Department of Insurance investigated charges that strike insurance actually encouraged publishers to force their employees out on strike.

The investigation was handled by the office of Jacob K. Javits, then attorney general of New York and now a Republican U.S. Senator from New York.

"On July 26, 1956," Javits reported, "I was advised by the Department of Insurance that the filings of each insurance company involved were rejected on the ground that approval of such coverage would be contrary to public policy."

But that didn't stop the American Newspaper Publishers' Association. They merely transferred their strike insurance to other companies and moved it into Canada—beyond the reach of U.S. laws.

Premiums for this insurance are high. Cost of the 50-day policy for one newspaper is $12,262.50 per year.

But payment of $24,525 has given the Portland publishers $1 million and 50 days for their cold-blooded attempt to starve out their union employees.

Existence of newspaper strike insurance has been known for several years. But only last spring were the details of the plan made known. The American Newspaper Guild acquired copies of a memorandum of the Newspaper Publishers' Premium Fund Committee.

The plan was set up, according to the memorandum, by publishers to cover losses resulting from strikes. The memo says that responsible underwriters are willing to provide such insurance under a group plan. It predicts that total coverage issued by the underwriters will be not less than $17.5 million.

The underwriters are not named, but their representatives are Mendes and Mount, 27 William Street, New York, N.Y. Mendes and Mount are the New York attorneys of Lloyds' of London.

ANPA COUNSEL CALLS TURN

Montreal Trust Co. of Canada is the escrow agent to which all premiums are paid. This company issues strike insurance to newspapers on the advice of Elisha Hanson, general counsel for the American Newspaper Publishers' Association.

Montreal Trust Co. pays strike insurance claims in U.S. dollars.

Payments are made starting with the eighth day of a strike.

If publication is totally suspended, publishers are paid the full amount of daily indemnity. If publication is partially suspended, the amount paid includes (1) fixed charges, (2) expenses that cannot be eliminated during partial suspension, and (3) profits the publisher is prevented from earning because of partial suspension.

Armed with their new strike insurance weapon, the publishers of the Oregonian and Journal deliberately took positions in negotiations that obviously could not be accepted by the Stereotypers' Union. They refused to bargain in good faith. Other newspaper unions ran into the same arrogant attitudes in their negotiations with the publishers.

That the publishers deliberately planned and provoked the strike seems clear also from the speed with which they brought to Portland an organized crew of professional strikebreakers.

STRIKEBREAKING VETS HERE

Strike insurance and a pool of strikebreakers are the coordinated one-two punch adopted by antiunion newspaper publishers all over the country. This is the strategy in Westchester County, New York, where the Macy chain of newspapers has embarked on a union-busting campaign.

It is in Westchester County that the activities of the Bloor Schleppey strikebreaking service to publishers has been bared by an investigating committee of the New York State Legislature. Key men in previous Bloor Schleppey strikebreaking operations are now in Portland working for the hybrid Oregonian-Journal.

Strike insurance for the Newhouse chain is just like finding money. Even if Sam Newhouse has to pay out the $12,262.50 premium each year for each of his 14 newspapers, he is money ahead if he provokes a strike at only one of his operations.

Payment for insurance protection against losses over which one has no control is a legitimate procedure. But to be covered against losses over which the publishers themselves do have control is another matter.

LABOR SPURNS SIMILAR PLAN

Can a publisher insure himself against strike losses and then deliberately provoke a strike in order to collect money to finance a union-busting operation? This is clearly not the basis on which insurance policies are normally written.

This is the same as taking out fire insurance on a building and then deliberately setting fire to it in order to collect the insurance.

No wonder the premiums are high. No wonder the money is kept in a bank outside the borders and jurisdiction of the United States of America.

A similar insurance plan was offered to the AFL–CIO to insure members against time lost during strikes. It was turned down flatly.

Nelson Cruikshank, director of the AFL–CIO Department of Social Insurance, termed the plan a violation of the principles of both insurance and unionism.

"You don't insure when the risk is increased by the insurance," Cruikshank said. "A group of workers might have a grievance and the insurance would encourage them to call for a walkout when the problem could be settled peacefully."

"These forms of insurance actually provoke strikes," Cruikshank said.

Portland's newspaper strike is a perfect illustration of the dangers foreseen by the AFL–CIO in refusing to become involved in strike insurance plans.

WHOLE COMMUNITY ENDANGERED

But Samuel Newhouse, owner of the Oregonian, has no such scruples against strike insurance. He is a leader in the group of publishers who have put strike insurance in to effect.

Newspaper unions are alert to the danger of strike insurance. It is a vicious and potent weapon in the effort to drive unions from newspaper plants. Combined with the equally potent professional strikebreaker weapon, it becomes doubly dangerous.

The danger is not only to union members, but to any community where free, collective bargaining for legitimate labor goals has been recognized as an American tradition.

Aroused public opinion against the insurance-financed strikebreaker tactics of the Oregonian and Journal has been the best answer in Portland.

You have one way in which to express your opinion: By canceling your subscription.

OREGONIAN'S ABSENTEE LANDLORD—NEWHOUSE SETS STRIFE PATTERN

To publish Samuel I. Newhouse, it's an old, old story—this strike and lockout at the Portland newspapers.

His record of constant clash with labor speaks for itself.

Examples:

The first strike in the history of the American Newspaper Guild was in 1933 against the Staten Island (N.Y.) Advance—a Newhouse newspaper.

The first strike in the 25-year history of the St. Louis Newspaper Guild was against the Globe-Democrat—a Newhouse newspaper.

And now it's Portland—where the Oregonian has been published since 1950 by the absentee landlord from New York City.

The pattern is clear.

And the pattern of his life is just as clear. Newhouse is a businessman with a sharp eye for the fast buck—bucks which have come fast enough that the value of his vast publishing empire is estimated at from $150 million to $200 million.

The secret of this business success can be spelled out with two words—purchase and consolidation. He buys papers. He consolidates them. And he winds up, when the plan works, with a one-newspaper city—his newspaper.

It happened in Syracuse, N.Y.

It happened in Harrisburg, Pa.

It could happen in Portland.

With his 14 newspapers, Newhouse is America's third largest chain publisher. (And how he hates that word chain.)

Yet in the cities from coast to coast in which he operates, Newhouse is almost unknown.

Only twice since he bought the Oregonian 9 years ago (for $5½ million in cash) has Newhouse visited Portland.

Newhouse is himself no newspaperman. He does no writing. He does not personally direct editorial policies of his vast holdings. He is interested only in making the money that enables him to collect an annual salary of $250,000.

Newhouse is a man of action—action which at times has proved downright amazing. He bought the Oregonian in a telephone conversation. He bought his Syracuse papers in the same way. (He'd never even been in the city, he said.)

He is said to know the financial condition of every major paper in the country. If true, this explains his success in moving so quickly.

Yet once a deal is completed he has shown an astounding lack of interest in his properties—except for the financial reports.

On his first visit to Portland he had to be persuaded even to take a look at the Oregonian plant. He was there 10 minutes, remarked that "it's three times too big," and left.

Newhouse is outspoken in his belief in mergers.

In Editor and Publisher, trade magazine of the newspaper publishing business, he was quoted as saying current tax problems make it advisable for local papers to gain strength by affiliation with other newspapers.

This, of course, spells merger.

And as another magazine, Printers' Ink, pointed out, Newhouse is "always on the prowl for available properties."

Newhouse, 64, was born in New York City, the oldest of eight children of immigrant Russian parents. He passed bar exams but junked a legal career to buy newspapers. When he was 25, he purchased his first one. And it was a classic transaction.

He bought a paper in Fitchburg, Mass., kept it a year and sold it at a 50 percent profit. And for the entire year hardly anyone in Fitchburg even knew what Newhouse looked like.

Newhouse is publicity shy. He gave the first speech of his life last year. It lasted 3 minutes, and he said he'll give no more.

He does not take part in community affairs, confines himself to business ventures.

As Joe Bailey, vice president of the International Typographical Union, put it:

"If he (Newhouse) has done anything constructive for humanity in this country, I have yet to learn of it."

Perhaps, the strangest statement ever made by Newhouse was uttered shortly after he purchased the Oregonian.

"A newspaper," he was quoted by Editor & Publisher, "is more than a press and rolls of print. It must have continuity of tradition and service. Such continuity is best achieved by retaining and aiding the men and women who give the newspaper its character."

This philosophy—"retaining and aiding the men and women who give the newspaper its character"—from an absentee publisher who has been an antagonist of labor in every city in which he has operated.

This philosophy from a publisher whose "men and women" have been supplanted by imported strikebreakers.

NEWHOUSE EMPIRE

These are the 14 newspapers, 9 radio and television stations, and 9 magazines owned or controlled by Samuel I. Newhouse:

The Oregonian, Newark Star-Ledger, St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Syracuse Herald-Journal, Syracuse Herald-American, Syracuse Post-Standard, Staten Island Advance, Long Island Press, Long Island Star-Journal, Harrisburg Patriot, Harrisburg Evening News, Jersey Journal, Birmingham News, and Huntsville (Ala.) Times.

KOIN–TV and KOIN–AM in Portland; WSYR–TV and WSYR–AM and FM in Syracuse; WTPA–TV in Harrisburg, and WAPI–TV, WAPI–AM and FM in Birmingham, Ala.

Vogue, Vogue Pattern Book, British Vogue, French Vogue, House & Garden, British House & Garden, French House & Garden, Glamour, and Bride's magazine.

"CAN WE TRUST THE PAPERS?"—DR. STEINER CALLS FOR FACTS IN THE NEWSPAPER STRIKE

A public without adequate information upon which to render a judgment has a vital stake in the current strike-lockout of Portland's two daily newspapers, Dr. Richard M. Steiner declared in a recent sermon. Dr. Steiner is minister of the First Unitarian Church.

"We are dependent upon rumors and upon the biased statements printed by the party that has control of the main avenue of information," he declared.

He called for the truth and asked: "Can we trust the newspapers to give us the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?"

Half truths, he noted, "can be as deceptive as outright lies."

Dr. Steiner is himself a former newspaperman, having served as reporter for the Chicago News Bureau and the Cleveland (Ohio) News. He has, in addition, been an instructor of journalism at Washington State College and Bradley College, of Peoria, Ill.

He is an active participant in Portland's civic life, serving as board member of the City Club, of which he is past president, and taking a leading role in such agencies as CARE, the USO council, Council of Social Agencies, the Child Guidance clinic and the Cerebral Palsy and Mental Health associations.

Dr. Steiner said there are two reasons for the public's confusion over the newspaper strike. "In the first place," he said, "they cannot believe that the right is all on one side, and as far as the printed word is concerned, only one side has access to the newspapers and it quite obviously considers itself to be without fault in the present controversy."

He continued:

"When it comes to presenting their case to the public, the newspapers have all the advantage. We are, as a result, surfeited with rumors. Whether these rumors are deliberately incited or not, no one can say. Whether there is any truth in them or not, no one can say. We are told, for example, that the strike is a plot by the Oregonian to take over the Oregon Journal, which has been in financial difficulties. This has been denied, but anyone reading the denial must wonder if the publishers have not left themselves an out when they say 'at this time' they do not contemplate an absorption of the Oregon Journal into the Newhouse chain.

"We have heard that the issue is 'featherbedding,' that the union refuses to settle the issue as to how many men shall work on a machine for stereotyping that the Oregonian says it is going to purchase. I have heard it reported on one hand that the union is willing to arbitrate the number of men on the machine when, as, and if it is delivered. I have heard that the machine is not actually in existence, that one was made in Germany, imported to Montreal, Canada, and there it developed so many defects it had to be returned for redesign, that no one knows whether the new machine will prove effective or not.

"If this is the issue that is holding up the settlement of the strike, if the Journal is not interested in this machine, how does it happen that the Journal lends itself to this issue? This is a fair question, I think, and one which ought to be answered, but how are we to find the answer? How are we to get it?

"Featherbedding is a real problem and will become more acute as automation increases. Its solution does not lie in strikes or lockouts, but in statesmanship.

"I have heard it rumored that the Oregonian does not want to settle the strike until its insurance strike benefits run out, by which time it hopes to have brought the Journal and the unions to their knees. The benefits, by the way, make it possible, I am told, to pay strikebreakers $200 a week. Is it true?

"The newspapers must be cognizant of these rumors, but they have not affirmed or denied them.

"I have heard it rumored that the Oregonian and the Journal are out to 'bust the unions,' that they are insisting upon an 'open shop' from reporters to pressmen. If these rumors are true (and I do not say they are true because I do not know) they ought to be matters of public concern.

"With the consolidation of newspapers that is taking place all over the country—and the Newhouse interests are playing a major part in these consolidations—the labor market for those whose only skills are in newspaper work is being diminished. Thus in an open shop, the wage scale is apt to be depressed for there are an increasing number of applicants for every job, and the law of supply and demand, when not protected by unionism, works just as well in the labor market as it does in the marts of trade.

"Indeed, one of the tragic consequences of the present controversy is the job uncertainty of the men and women who have dedicated their lives to the profession of journalism and who have given to the city of Portland high examples of professional competency as reporters, some of them winning national awards for their work.

"Indeed, the Pulitzer prize, which the Oregonian boasts of, was won for them by Guild members who are now uncertain as to the future of their jobs."

Dr. Steiner noted the publishers' charge that by respecting the picket lines and staying off their jobs, members of the Newspaper Guild and the craft unions have broken their

contracts. "This may be true," he said, "but, if it is true, the newspapers have recourse to the courts under the Taft-Hartley law for damages. So far, I have heard of no threat of such suit.

"Surely the newspaper publishers are not so naive as to believe that those who owe so much to their unions would cross a picket line. The union movement is based on solidarity. If unions don't hang together, they shall surely hang separately—to quote a much honored and revered Revolutionary leader."

In conclusion Dr. Steiner declared that the responsibility both of the unions and of the publishers in the present controversy is of concern to the public "and we ought to make known our concern to those who have accepted the responsibility to keep us informed."

OREGON COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
December 16, 1959.

GOV. MARK HATFIELD,
Salem, Oreg.

DEAR GOVERNOR HATFIELD: We were delighted to read of your offer to union and management to aid in settling the tragic dispute involving our two Portland newspapers, but regretted to learn of management's decision to reject your proffered help on the grounds that nothing could be accomplished. However, we fervently hope you will not let the matter rest with this initial failure.

Many ministers and laymen, not only in the greater Portland area but throughout the State, are tremendously concerned about this economic cold war which gives indication of erupting into violence. We have in our congregations families that are in economic distress at the Christmas season because of the strike, and others in the ranks of management who are greatly involved in the tension and strife.

More is involved in the strike than human need, economic issues, and strife. The fate of a community newspaper may very well be at stake. We do not feel that the press can rightly assume the strike is their private business. Newspapers are more than private enterprise; they are a public trust. Their policies and destinies are a community concern.

I am confident that the many ministers and church leaders with whom I have talked, and others whose attitude I can surmise, join with me in urging you to make continued efforts in urging management and labor to sit down with you and a factfinding group. I do not feel that public opinion will allow the newspapers to reject indefinitely your offer of assistance.

Just as the importunate widow was finally heard by the judge because of her persistence, so we are confident you will be heeded by the Portland newspapers if you continue to insist that there should be an honest attempt at settlement through your high office.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD GLEN BROWN,
President, Oregon Council of Churches,
Minister, First Christian Church of Portland.

[From the Guild Reporter, Washington, D.C., Jan. 8, 1960]

PORTLAND STRIKE

The Portland, Oreg., strike holds more significance than appears from casual inspection.

From all obtainable evidence, the Portland work stoppage serves as a pattern which, if it succeeds, could lead to its adoption elsewhere in the newspaper industry, to the complete destruction of union-won safeguards in pay and working conditions.

First, the Portland strike was planned and provoked by management, more specifically the management of the Oregonian, which dominates the Portland scene over its normal rival, the Journal.

There is no doubt of this fact. Last summer, before any Portland union had even planned an approach to collective bargaining in the fall, strikebreakers then at work in Reno were aware that they would be needed in Oregon later in the year.

And the negotiations, when they opened with the stereotypers' spokesmen, were farcical. Management introduced a trumped-up issue, increased its own demands as the union tried to make concessions.

Second, the massive retaliation familiar to guildsmen in Cleveland, Detroit, Boston, and New York takes shape in Portland, too. The Journal has made common cause with its business competitor, the Oregonian. Journal executives moved into the Oregonian plant to make it possible to get out a hybrid daily.

Third, the Oregonian carries strike insurance, beyond question, since its owners, the Newhouse interests, have strong representation in the insurance plan set up by the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

And lastly, the Newhouse management, absentee owners in Portland as in many other places across the country, is notoriously cash-register-oriented and oblivious to community interests, if they interfere with the moneymaking operation of its dailies.

There is increasing belief in Portland that the Journal, home-owned, has been taken captive by the larger, stronger and chain-newspaper-backed Oregonian. There have even been flat predictions that the Journal's days are numbered, and that the Newhouse plan is to emerge on top in Portland, making it a one-newspaper city.

Fortunately for the unions affected, there had been complete awareness from the time negotiations broke down, that this was no "ordinary" one-union strike. Other unions were quick to come to the aid of the stereotypers and presently there is a well-coordinated council of unions directing the overall strategy of the situation.

Fortunately, too, radio and television stations in Portland not under the censoring thumb of the struck dailies have been spreading the facts.

The year-end issue of Oregon Labor Press, edited by Portland Guildsman James W. Goodsell with the help of an augmented staff of strikers, ran off enough copies so that it could be distributed to almost every home in the Portland area where the dailies circulate.

Its message, "the other side of the strike story," has already brought encouraging support, and more importantly, a wider realization of the potentials in the ruthless, ominous drama being enacted behind the picketed entrances of the Oregonian plant.

The picture is a gruesome one. Given strike insurance and the willingness to import a loathsome crew of strikebreakers, there is also the possibility of the extinction of Portland's home-owned newspaper. In its place, readers would have a daily single-mindedly devoted to making money for its east-coast owner, who is a financial operator, not a publisher. It's an ugly situation, dangerous to the public welfare, to the industry and to its unions.

PORTLAND OPEN SHOP BID SPURS SUMMIT SESSION

PORTLAND, OREG.—Faced with a clear attempt by major unionized newspapers to establish plantwise open shops, international leaders of all unions involved in the Portland stereotypers' walkout converged here this week for a conference on strike strategy and coordination.

ANG President Arthur Rosenstock and Director of Organization J. William Blatz were here to represent the guild at the meeting, which began Wednesday, January 6. Also on hand were officials of the Stereotypers, the International Typographical Union, the Pressmen, the Photoengravers, and the Teamsters.

The meeting resulted from an invitation to the union leaders extended by Harold D. Bamberg, chairman of the Portland Newspaper Unions' Interim Committee, to "observe personally this fantastic union-busting operation."

Last weekend, ANG Secretary-Treasurer Charles A. Perlik, Jr., conferred with local guild officers and addressed a membership meeting Sunday night. International Representative Loel Schrader has been assigned to join International Representative Charles Dale in working with the local.

As the 10th week of the strike against the Oregon Journal and S. I. Newhouse's Oregonian drew to a close, there were these other developments:

The Legislative Interim Committee on Labor-Management Relations scheduled a public hearing at the State capital, Salem, January 9, on the impact of professional strikebreakers on free collective bargaining.

Public support swelled for a third, independent daily newspaper proposed as a community-owned enterprise.

Gov. Mark Hatfield for the second time declined to appoint a factfinding committee to intervene in the strike. As long as the managements of the two dailies refuse to cooperate with such a committee, he said, its appointment would be "fruitless."

Web pressmen, by a vote of 108 to 1, and paperhandlers, by a vote of 22 to 0, officially joined the stereotypers as strikers, January 2, and charged the companies before the National Labor Relations Board with bad faith in their refusal to bargain on a renewal of the unions' contracts, which expired December 31.

The stereotypers, who struck on November 10, also filed charges with the NLRB that the Oregonian and the Journal had refused to bargain in good faith.

A guild member became the object of telephoned and personal threats after four imported strikebreakers were beaten up in a barroom brawl with strangers.

The Oregournal—the hybrid daily being produced by scabs under the flags of both the Oregonian and the Journal—continued its throwaway circulation policy against a rising flood of cancellations.

The top-level conference of union officials this week underscored the seriousness with which they regard the Portland situation. The belief is growing among unionists that the Oregonian and Journal have launched their union-busting adventure as a pilot operation. Should the two papers succeed in ousting the unions with the use of strikebreakers, publishers in other large cities could be expected to try it, too, spreading industrial warfare throughout the industry.

Management tactics at the bargaining table before the walkout were enough to convince Portland union members that the strike was deliberately provoked.

The companies insisted that the stereotypers' workweek be increased from 35 hours to 37½ hours, at no increase in pay. In the first bargaining session after the strike started, the publishers called for a further increase in the workweek to 40 hours at no increase in pay. Since the strike the papers also have demanded elimination of the union-security clause from the stereos' contract. Management also has taken the position that long-standing policies on substitutions and union membership of foremen must be stricken from the pact.

One of the key issues in the dispute is the insistence of the Oregonian that the stereotypers agree in advance to one man operation of a new, untried German casting machine the paper says it plans to buy. The

union replies that this would be buying a "pig in a poke," that the machine is not in operation anywhere in the country and there is no way yet to determine how many men its operation will require. In its only installation so far on this continent—in Montreal—the machine developed serious "bugs" which raise questions of safety no matter how many men are operating it, the union points out.

These bargaining tactics of management and its reliance on strike insurance to recruit professional strikebreakers are the basis of the stereotypers' unfair practice charges filed with the NLRB.

The pressmen's charges against the two papers cite management's repeated refusal even to meet with the union to discuss renewal of its contract. On December 30, the day before the pressmen's contract expired, the papers notified the union that its members no longer were employees. At the same time, the publishers mailed checks to individual pressmen covering accrued vacation pay.

All unions at the Oregonian and the Journal plan to present evidence and witnesses at the Legislative Interim Committee's hearing on strikebreaking. Representatives of the two newspapers also have been invited to appear.

The committee will consider the importation of strikebreakers in relation to the overall labor-management scene in the State and will not delve into the issues which provoked the Portland strike. It was the current strike, however, which prompted the call for the hearing.

The call was by a unanimous vote of the committee's members, who represent both houses of the State legislature.

Petitions signed by hundreds of unionists idled in the strike were presented to Governor Hatfield Tuesday, January 5, calling for an inquiry by a fact-finding body. The petitions were presented by a group which included Mrs. Frances Blakely of the Guild. The Governor accepted the petitions but pointed out fact-finding was impossible without the cooperation of management as well as the unions. Earlier in the dispute, fact-finding proposals of the Governor and U.S. Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER were spurned by the publishers. The unions had welcomed the offers.

The idea for another daily paper—tentatively designated the Portland Daily News—grew out of the fear that merger with or acquisition of the Journal is one of the goals of Newhouse's Oregonian.

When the strike bagn, a Journal executive remarked: "This strike situation means the windup of the Journal and the windup of me. The Oregonian is going to take us over when this strike is done."

At least one Journal circulation representative in central Oregon has urged subscribers who have canceled to take the paper again "because this strike is a secret plot by Newhouse and the unions to take over the Journal."

After repeated denials by Journal officials that it was for sale to anyone, a committee was formed to explore the possibility of another, independent daily.

A luncheon meeting of Portland union representatives unanimously voted to support "a profesionally managed and operated newspaper, independent in news coverage." They had heard from James T. Marr, executive secretary of the State AFL-CIO, that facilities already have been located for printing a new paper.

A coupon in the weekly Oregon Labor Press, intended to poll readers regarding their interest in another daily, brought such a response that four women were retained to handle the returns. Two television stations covered the scene in the Labor Press office as mail sacks were opened and thousands of coupons counted.

Although the poll did not solicit funds for the proposed Daily News, hundreds of $1 and $5 bills and numerous checks were enclosed with the coupon returns.

The outbreak of violence in the strike, and the subsequent threats against the person of a guild photographer, were attributed to the scabs themselves by Guild President Bob Shults.

Shults told the membership meeting Sunday night that local officers had spent 4 days running down information about the brawl in the bar of the Hungerford Hotel in which the four strikebreakers were beaten.

"We are convinced that the photographer had absolutely no connection with the incident," said Shults, "and further that no unionist was involved. We are deeply suspicious that the whole thing was staged by the scabs themselves to create an excuse either to leave town now that the strike insurance is running out or to move out of the hotel and across the street into the newspaper plant where their every whim would be satisfied by management."

The guild photographer, who formerly had lived in the Hungerford before it was taken over by the strikebreakers, had dropped in for a New Year's drink with the bartender, a personal friend. About 15 minutes after he left, a fight started between four of the scabs and four strangers. During the fracas, a chair was hurled through a huge plate glass window in the lobby of the hotel and the bar was nearly demolished. One of the scabs reportedly was hospitalized overnight.

The holiday season had at least one bright spot for guild members. Some 200 members and their spouses were entertained at a guild party, December 29, in the press club. Use of the club's facilities was donated, as were all drinks and food. Additional cash contributions actually gave the local a net of $21.20, Shults reported. Running the party were several ex-members of the local, headed by former president Bob Swan, who is now in public relations.

[From the AFL-CIO News, Washington, D.C., Jan. 9, 1960]

PORTLAND PAPERS OUT TO CRUSH UNIONS—STRIKEBREAKERS PAID UP TO $300 WEEKLY

PORTLAND, OREG.—The 2-month-old strike of the stereotypers against Portland's daily newspapers, focusing national attention in the newspaper industry on the showdown struggle here, is forcing unions in the field to consider major new tactics.

As the strike drags on, it has become more apparent that managements of the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal aim at nothing less than crushing all the newspaper unions involved in the dispute.

The stereotypers struck November 10 after failing to make any headway in negotiating a new contract. Their old agreement with the two papers expired September 15. The publishers refused to discuss wages or any other contract matters unless the union agreed first to three demands:

That a German-built automated metal plate-casting machine, which the Oregonian says it proposed to buy, be operated by one man. Present equipment is operated by four men. The German machine is untested in this country and has not even been seen by the stereotypers.

That foremen not be required to belong to the union. They have been in all past contracts. Foremen work alongside other men, perform the same duties.

That the union give up its right to provide substitutes.

All other unions in the two plants—printers, pressman, engravers, mailers, paperhandlers and Newspaper Guild of reporters, editors and photographers—observed the picket lines. But the publishers imported strikebreakers, chiefly from the South, and began immediately to publish a joint product in the Oregonian plant. Some of the imports have been identified as veterans of such strikebreaking operations as Lima, Ohio, Haverhill, Mass., Miami, Fla., Reno, Nev., and Oklahoma City.

The job pirates receive premium pay—up to more than $300 weekly—and are quartered at the publishers' expense in a nearby hotel. Management also picks up food and bar tabs.

Husband and wife teams are frequent among the strikebreakers. The women operate teletypesetter machines, on which news copy is translated into perforated tape, which in turn is fed through automated linotype machines. The publishers were caught early in the strike working some of the women 12 hours a day, 72 hours a week, in flagrant violation of State law which fixes a maximum 44-hour week for women.

A public hearing on importation of strikebreakers and its impact on labor-management relations in Oregon was scheduled for January 9 by an interim committee of the State legislature.

LAVISH OUTLAYS

Lavish outlays for recruiting and paying strikebreakers and setting up a training school for new ones at the Journal plant are made possible by payments from a publishers' strike insurance plan.

Each management can collect up to $10,000 daily over a 50-day period for a combined total of $1 million.

The stereotypers have offered compromises on each of the three management demands—compromises which formed the basis of peaceful settlement of the same issues at Detroit. But the publishers have refused to consider them and instead have come up with five new demands:

An open shop.

Re-examination of manning agreements on all other stereotyping equipment.

A 5-hour increase in the workweek at no increase in pay.

Priority and seniority for strikebreakers.

A no-strike clause.

Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, Republican, successful last year in mediating other labor disputes, offered his services but the publishers refused them. Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, proposed a citizens' factfinding panel to study the strike and drew a similar curt rejection from the publishers. The unions had welcomed both proposals.

Unfair labor practice charges have been filed by the stereotypers on the basis of use of strike insurance funds to import and train strikebreakers, and by the web pressmen based on the publishers' refusal to bargain in good faith.

The pressmen's contract expired December 31. Four days earlier, management notified the local its members were no longer employees. With expiration of the contracts, the pressmen and the affiliated paper handlers voted to strike and joined other crafts on the picket line.

NEW PAPER POSSIBLE

To get their story before the public, the unions have turned to radio, TV, and handbills. A special edition of 300,000 copies of the Oregon Labor Press, devoted entirely to the strike, was mailed out to all residents in the Portland area. Now Portland's labor movement is taking steps to start a third daily newspaper in the city. Business agents and secretaries of unions in the area have voted support for such a paper, to be financed by sale of stock.

International officers of newspaper unions will hold a summit meeting in Portland this month to discuss financing for the venture.

A committee of newspaper union representatives is preparing cost estimates, locating publishing facilities, and determining staff requirements for the proposed new paper, tentatively named the Portland Daily News.

Union members have launched a house-to-house canvass to measure public interest in such a paper and to press, at the same time, a campaign to persuade those still taking the combined Oregonian-Journal to cancel their subscriptions. Cancellations already are estimated to have reached 100,000.

[From the Oregon Labor Press, Jan. 15, 1960]

STRIKEBREAKER'S WITNESS IDENTIFIES PROFESSIONALS HERE

Professional strikebreakers now working at the Oregonian-Journal have swarmed into struck newspaper plants across the country—sent by a central strikebreaking agency.

So testified Gerald E. Gish, who as recently as 2 years ago worked shoulder to shoulder, breaking strikes, with many of the persons now employed behind picket lines at the Oregonian.

His testimony came before the State legislative interim committee on labor-management relations which met in Salem Saturday to explore possible legislation against the importing or use of professional strikebreakers.

Some 300 spectators, including four busloads of workers idled by the Portland newspaper strike, crowded the hearing room.

The implication of Gish's testimony was vehemently denied by the three Portland attorneys who appeared for the Oregonian and Oregon Journal. They argued to the committee that legislation against importing nonunion employees during a strike would discriminate against businesses requiring technically skilled employees.

Gish, now a union printer at the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, said he was affiliated with an organization known as the Schleppey-Klein strikebreaking agency from 1955 to 1957 and worked at a number of struck newspaper plants in various parts of the country.

He told of receiving premium pay, transportation and living expenses and even of being paid $110 a week for doing nothing while on standby duty for a month before a strike in Westchester County, N.Y.

"The highest I ever got was $627 for 1 week in the Zanesville, Ohio, strike," he told the committee.

A dramatic point in the hearing came when State Representative Edward J. Whelan, Portland, held up five snapshots of strikebreakers, taken on the Portland picket lines.

Gish identified the pictures and then picked out the names of 10 other strikebreakers—now at the Oregonian-Journal—with whom he had worked in other strikes.

The first of three attorneys appearing for management was William Lubersky, who said he represented the Oregonian and Associated Oregon Industries. He rejected the contention that the Portland papers had dealt with Schleppey-Klein or any other strikebreaking agency.

"I am emphatically denying," he said, "any collusion between the publishers. There were no employees on standby. Management did not want a strike."

Under questioning by committee members, Lubersky admitted that probably there had been advance planning. He said: "An employer who is threatened with a strike has every right to start laying plans to operate."

He said he guesses that the newspapers paid transportation and living expenses to the imported workers "who came in to help us out in an emergency."

At the end of the hearing, State Senator Harry Boivin of Klamath Falls, committee chairman, and State Senator Walter Pearson of Portland said several suggestions had been made and information collected which might lead to legislation.

Labor's presentation was led by George Brown, political education director of the Oregon AFL–CIO. He told the committee that the importation of professional strikebreakers is "a departure from normal, peaceful, intelligent collective bargaining and is not in the best interests of the citizens of this State."

Brown continued: "Acceptance of the use of professional strikebreakers will mean a return to the law of the jungle."

Appearing during labor's presentation was Dr. Richard Steiner, minister of the First Unitarian Church of Portland. He said he was not speaking for labor or management but as a member of the public.

Management, he argued, has a big advantage "because it can propagandize the public without hindrance. This is an advantage that is unfair. It is enhanced by the use of professional strikebreakers."

The committee can help overcome the unfair advantage by recommending legislation against strikebreakers, whose presence prolongs the strike, Dr. Steiner concluded.

In his testimony he told of a phone call from a woman who wanted advice. She had been asked, she told him, to get a strikebreaker into a compromising position—without doing anything actually immoral. Would he sanction this?

Dr. Steiner postulated several explanations for the call to the committee. In one he suggested the call might have been a "plant" from management of the newspapers or their sympathizers, designed to discredit or embarrass him.

The fourth union spokesman at the hearing was Rene Valentine, International representative of the Typographical Union, who traced the history of strikebreaking agencies and reviewed investigations into such activities in other States.

Gish detailed his own history as a strikebreaker, dating from a loan he received while still a student in Oklahoma.

His strikebreaking career started in Oklahoma City and then went to Zanesville, Ohio. Other strikes took him to Grand Junction, Colo.; Levittown, Pa., and Westchester County, N.Y.

LAWYERS OBJECT

Management's presentation, consisting largely of rebuttal, was begun by Lubersky who contended that labor's case was "both hypocritical and sanctimonious."

The sole purpose of labor's testimony, he said, "is to have another forum in the propaganda battle."

This point was later echoed by Portland attorney Verne Newcomb, who rapped labor for not bringing specific legislative proposals to the committee meeting. He was cut short, however by Senator Pearson, who pointed out that the committee's purpose was not to hear proposed laws but only to explore the need for legislation.

Both Lubersky and Newcomb argued that management had the right to continue to operate and that since technically skilled nonunion newspaper workers are not available in Oregon, it would be discriminatory to legislate against the importing of workers during a strike.

Replying to this, Richard Carney, Portland labor attorney, argued that the objectionable aspect of the strikebreakers was not their importation but their professionalism.

These workers, he said, do not have regular jobs or homes, but make their living touring the country from strike to strike. The existence of such a pool of strikebreaking workers is the evil, Carney said, since it is a deterrent to good-faith bargaining on management's part.

Management lawyers had claimed that only the Federal Government could properly enact legislation dealing with imported strikebreakers. Carney contended that a State law would be both practicable and proper

In addition to Chairman Boivin, Senator Pearson and Representaive Whelan, committee members attending the hearing were Senator Robert F. White of Salem, Representatives Robert Duncan, Medford, and William J. Gallagher, Portland; Dr. Richard H. Jones of Reed College, public member; Carl J. Gilson of Portland, labor member, and Hillman Lueddemann, Portland, management member.

MAYOR GETS UNION APPEAL—SCHRUNK IS ASKED TO SETTLE STRIKE

An earnest appeal for help, signed by about 80 union officers and members, was sent this week to Mayor Terry Schrunk.

The letter asked Schrunk to move with dispatch in an effort to settle the current strike against Portland's two daily newspapers.

Last month Schrunk invited both George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, and Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell to hold a proposed top level labor-management conference in Portland. The major noted the need for "an improvement of attitudes being displayed at the collective bargaining table."

The union members' appeal to Schrunk said:

"In your recent letters to AFL–CIO President George Meany and Secretary of Labor James Mitchell, you called special attention to this area as being free from the frictions and pressures which might exist in other areas. These cancerous frictions are now rampant in this area. This is a condition that the city of Portland cannot afford."

The letter pointed out that the newspaper strike-lockout is farther from settlement now than it was when the strike began November 10.

"Offers of aid by the Governor have been brushed aside by the publishers. Federal mediation is ineffectual. The publishers seem adamant in their joint effort to disrupt the harmonious union-management relationship traditional in the City of Roses," it said.

"We ask you as chief executive of the city where this deplorable condition exists to move with dispatch in an effort to settle this dispute, which has become a conflict for the control of men's minds," the letter concluded.

LEADERS MEET IN PORTLAND—UNIONS PLEDGE FULL STRIKE AID

Publishers of Portland's struck newspapers have forced "the most significant and far-reaching team effort by national newspaper unions in the history of the American newspaper industry."

So said a statement released this week following a two-day summit conference of leaders of international unions whose locals are involved in the present 10-week-old Portland strike.

The officials gathered here at the request of heads of the locals.

The nine visiting officials, after the first day of meeting, described Portland as a "national battleground," and said they were shocked by the "obstinacy and bad faith" of management's stand.

Among those who met with local officers were Arthur Rosenstock, president of the American Newspaper Guild; Walter J. Turner, national vice president of the Pressmen's Union, and Leo Feeney, national vice president of the Stereotypers.

The text of their final statement follows:

We are united on a negotiating program with the publishers of Portland's strike-bound newspapers. The decision for common action by all newspaper unions was forced upon us by the blatant union-busting techniques employed by the publishers.

The international unions cannot afford and do not intend to permit their local unions to be destroyed by a giant newspaper chain and its Portland satellite. The labor movement of Portland and the entire State of Oregon cannot afford to permit this return to labor's dark ages.

Since the strike began on November 10, management has consistently raised its demands on the unions instead of seeking a peaceful and honorable solution at the bargaining table or through mediation efforts of Governor Hatfield or a fact-finding committee.

Chief of these new and outrageous demands is a management proposal that the stereotypers take a 12½ percent hourly pay cut despite the constantly increasing cost of living.

The publishers have chosen to make this an all-out fight. We must meet their challenge. We pledge the utmost support of the international unions to assure that this union-busting venture by the publishers is not successful.

Contracts of all of the mechanical craft unions have now expired. We reaffirm our decision that no union will return to work at the two newspapers until settlements are reached with all of the unions with expired contracts. Striking employees will return to work without fear of reprisal or discrimination. The unions agree that all contracts must have a common expiration date. All contracts must contain a clause allowing all unions to respect picket lines at the newspaper plants.

The publishers are publicly tied in a common front against unions, and have consistently rejected all union offers to negotiate separate contracts with the Oregon Journal and the Oregonian. This stone wall of publisher opposition has today created the most significant and far-reaching team effort by international newspaper unions in the history of the American newspaper industry.

MRS. KEEVER CONFESSES FALSE STORY

Mrs. James Keever, who has made a number of police reports about threats and violence because her husband is working behind the Oregonian picket line, this week was arrested, jailed, and convicted for making a false police report.

She confessed to police that she made up the story she told them early Sunday morning about being kidnapped for 7 hours by two men who threatened her because her husband, an Oregonian advertising salesman normally, was working as a pressman in the struck plant.

The conviction came Wednesday in the municipal court of Judge J. J. Labadie, who fined her $25.

The Keevers won front-page banner-headline treatment in the Oregonian-Journal last week when a window in their home at 6607 Southeast Duke Street was broken by a rock.

Mrs. Keever, 26, told police she made up the kidnapping story in the hope her husband would not find out she had really been out with a male acquaintance.

The incident began when her husband filed a missing persons report with police Friday evening. At 12:15 a.m., Mrs. Keever called him from an eastside cocktail bar and told the kidnapping story.

She repeated it to police later but when they pointed out inconsistencies, she confessed the story was false and admitted having gone to a basketball game with the male friend.

PORTLAND DAILY NEWS—SUPPORT IS STRONG FOR THIRD NEWSPAPER

Prospects for a third Portland newspaper continued to brighten this week on two fronts.

Union business representatives, at their weekly luncheon meeting Tuesday, heard detailed legal reports on the incorporation of the third paper, tentatively named the Portland Daily News.

As projected, it would be launched with union support but would have an independent editorial staff and policy and would be financed through broad public stock sale and support.

A demonstration of that support, termed "amazing" by State AFL–CIO Secretary-Treasurer James Marr, came in response to a coupon printed in the Oregon Labor Press 2 weeks ago.

Officeworkers were still processing returned coupons this week, although the pace dropped off from the first week when four volunteer workers were called in to handle the flood of mail.

But by press time, 2,509 coupons, many of them containing unsolicited contributions, had been mailed in.

This response came from a press run of 32,500. In other words, 7½ percent of all Labor Press readers took the trouble to fill out and clip the coupon, address an envelope and mail it with 4 cents postage.

The original outline for the paper was to start with 100,000 24-page papers, but later information reported to the union representatives Tuesday indicated that either the press run or the maximum number of pages can now be doubled—100,000 48-page papers or 200,000 24-page papers.

OREGONIAN-JOURNAL KNOWS ITS ARGUMENT IS FALSE

The hybrid Oregonian-Journal has a crafty disregard for facts. Nowhere is this better shown than in its recent editorial complaint that the longtime Portlanders who belong to unions at the two newspapers refused to go through the stereotypers' picket line.

Of course they refused to go through. What else did the publishers expect when they forced the stereotypers out on the street?

Union men have been respecting picket lines for 100 years and more. Yet the hybrid newspaper pretends that this is a new and dastardly thing.

Further, the Oregonian-Journal cynically argued in a front-page editorial that the unions were violating their contracts in refusing to cross the picket line. As if a union contract were a slave labor agreement, binding a man to work no matter what changes may occur in the conditions of his employment.

The Oregonian-Journal singled out the Newspaper Guild, arguing that the Guild was morally and legally bound by contract to go to work across the picket line.

That is utter nonsense. And the Oregonian-Journal's highly paid battery of legal experts knows it. They are lying in their teeth when they say the Guild broke a contract or took any step that was not the legal and moral right of the Guild.

The labor laws of this land guarantee the reporters, photographers, artists, and editors of the Guild the right to refuse to cross a picket line at their employer's plant.

The cynical staff of the Oregournal is merely trying to confuse the public in arguing that it is illegal or immoral for a union to refuse to cross a picket line.

Just think back to 1949 when the Pressmen's Union went on strike. By the publishers' cynical theory of 1959–60, the other unions should have come to work. Well, in 1949 some tried to. And what happened? The publishers shut down their plants, locked out the employees and refused to pay their wages. All that, despite labor contracts with the same unions as today.

Were the publishers then guilty of violating the contracts? By their 1959–60 reasoning they were. But the fact is—and the publishers know it—that was not the case.

Only a few weeks ago the hybrid newspaper published on its front page a story from New York, reporting a court decision on this matter. It said publishers need not pay employees when the publishers decide to shut down their plants in a strike.

The conclusion is obvious. If a labor contract does not bind the employer to pay his employees during a labor dispute, then that contract does not bind employees to work during a labor dispute. The National Labor Relations Act clearly recognizes this fact.

So let's have an end to the Oregonian-Journal's preaching about the sanctity of contracts that do not apply.

It is a phony, dishonest argument.

ONLY ONE SIDE CAN PROFIT FROM ACTS OF VIOLENCE

Last Sunday the combined Oregonian-Journal published another in its series of front-page editorials on the newspaper strike. This one, titled "Fact for Today," accused the unions of fostering violence.

This calls for a reply.

We ask you to consider four facts:

1. No responsible union leader condones the use of violence as a strike tactic.

2. Every decent union member regrets any outbreak of violence, whether the act was incited by union members or by strikebreakers.

3. The Portland newspaper strike, throughout its 9 weeks' duration, has been remarkably free of violent acts. Yes, there have been a few—but remarkably few, considering the tensions of the strike and the provocation supplied by the publishers and their imported strikebreakers.

4. It is the publishers—not the unions—who profit from any incident of violence that can be blamed on unionmen or on "persons unknown." They can play it up on their front page and they can write front-page editorials about it afterward.

There have been many indications that the Oregonian-Journal publishers actually have been hoping for "rough stuff" as grist for their propaganda mill.

The unions' position on the question of strike violence is quite simple. We believe it is (a) wrong and (b) stupid.

[From the AFL–CIO News, Washington, D.C., Jan. 16, 1960]

UNITED FRONT FORMALIZED—NEWSPAPER UNIONS IN PORTLAND PLEDGE PACTS FOR ALL OR NONE

PORTLAND, OREG.—Representatives of international unions whose locals have been battling savage union-busting tactics of the Oregon Journal and the Oregonian have agreed that "no union will return to work until settlements are reached with all of the unions."

Officers and international representatives of the stereotypers, newspaper guild, pressmen, Typographical Union, photo engravers and the unaffiliated Teamsters declared they "do not intend to permit local unions to be destroyed by a giant newspaper chain and its Portland satellite."

The Oregonian is owned by Samuel I. Newhouse of New York, whose empire includes 14 newspapers, 9 magazines and 9 radio and TV stations. The Oregonian has been publishing a joint paper with the Oregon Journal, using imported strikebreakers.

Union members employed by the two papers have been respecting the picket lines of the stereotypers, who struck November 10 after rejecting management proposals to

seriously weaken their contract. Meanwhile contracts of the other mechanical unions have expired.

The statement by the union representatives declared:

"Striking employees will return to work without fear of reprisal or discrimination. The unions agree that all contracts must have a common expiration date. All contracts must contain a clause allowing all unions to respect picket lines at the newspaper plants."

The joint newspaper dismissed the unions' statement as "negotiation by ultimatum."

Meanwhile, the imported-strikebreakers issue was aired at a public hearing of the State legislature's interim committee on labor-management relations.

UNIONISTS AROUSED

More than 200 newspaper union members packed the committee hearing room in the State capitol at Salem, 50 icy miles away, to hear labor offer evidence and argue the need for remedial legislation.

George Brown, director of political education for the Oregon AFL–CIO warned that if "this precedent is allowed to continue and is accepted as common practice in labor-management relations, it can spread to every industry in the State."

"There seems to be evidence that strikebreakers were in Portland on a standby basis even before the strike was called," he said.

A witness was Gerald E. Gish, of Cleveland, a Typographical Union member employed on the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, who testified he had once been a professional strikebreaker, connected with the Bloor Schleppey and Shirley Klein newspaper strikebreaking organizations.

Gish outlined his career in 1955-57 from his recruitment by Oklahoma City publishers 2 months before a strike there until he broke with the Klein group and helped the ITU organize strikebreakers at Glen Cove, Long Island, N.Y.

STRIKES PROVOKED?

In an hour-long appearance before the committee, Gish testified:

Strikebreakers usually draw premium wages and extensive overtime, plus eating allowances and hotel bills. Transportation is usually paid as well. Gish's top weekly check was $675 at Zanesville, Ohio.

Strikebreakers know in advance where strikes will occur, and he was among strikebreakers brought into Westchester County, N.Y., and kept on a standby basis before an ITU strike against the Macy chain of papers there. When for a time it appeared the ITU would not strike there, Gish quoted Shirley Klein as saying, "We'll have to provoke it."

Strikebreaking organizations know in advance the plant layouts at the newspapers which will call on their services, and assignments of key strikebreakers are predetermined.

Gish identified names or pictures of at least 15 strikebreakers now on the Portland scene as people he had known in other similar operations. His experience as a strikebreaker included work in Oklahoma City, Zanesville, Ohio, Grand Junction, Colo., Levitttown, Pa., and Westchester County, N.Y.

The publishers were represented at the hearing by two attorneys, who contended State legislation on the subject would be unconstitutional because it would be discriminatory against certain industries and because the Federal Government had preempted the field.

Management also denied that strikebreakers had been brought in on a standby basis, that publishers had used the services of the Schleppey-Klein organization or any such group and that premium wages were paid the strikebreakers.

On another front, James T. Marr, executive-secretary of the Oregon AFL–CIO, reported articles of incorporation have been drawn up for a third daily newspaper for Portland. Preliminary work has been launched, he said, on details of a stock sale campaign by which the publication, tentatively named the Portland Daily News, will be financed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief comment on the matter of strike insurance. It may seem plausible and reasonable to suggest that a newspaper take out strike insurance to cover a certain period. However, we ought to consider the public policy involved. When we do so, then I think we shall have a better idea as to why the State of New York frowns upon that kind of a policy.

Mr. President, this kind of an insurance policy is designed to help stir up labor strife, or will have that result, because if an employer has strike insurance for 4 or 6 or 8 weeks, he thinks that by playing tough he can destroy the union in 4 or 6 or 8 weeks. And so a basic question of public policy is involved.

It does not follow that any insurance policy ought to be recognized as a policy that will have standing within the law if the purpose of that policy is to endanger free collective bargaining in our country. And so what the Newhouse empire has done is to go up to Canada and enter into an insurance policy arrangement which it thinks will insure it, or at least protect it or strengthen it, in case it gets into a "strike busting" controversy with the union, such as it has gotten into in Portland, Oreg.

So, Mr. President, I would have the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare conduct a very thorough investigation with regard to the antilabor tactics being used by some newspaper publishers in this country, because, if I am correctly informed—and I am asking for an investigation to find out what the facts are—there has developed a combination of newspaper publishers in this country acting in concert in connection with this particular union-busting tactic.

Then I think there is a need for investigation on the part of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the practices, ascertaining to what extent the practices exist, of certain union-busting newspaper publishers who are working out a systematic arrangement with a business concern that contracts to assure and guarantee them that it will provide them with the necessary strikebreakers in case they get themselves involved in a strike with any of the newspaper unions in this country. That matter ought to be looked into.

Mr. President, there are other facets of antiunion activities on the part of newspaper publishers being raised in the Portland, Oreg., case which, in my judgment, call for investigation of the labor practices of newspapers in this country; and I shall offer a resolution within the next few days seeking to accomplish the end of having the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare take over a thorough investigation of this problem.

Mr. President, I think it is about time, may I say in conclusion, that the people of Oregon are relieved from the news monopoly of the Oregonian and the Journal, because, whether they are published in one plant under one management or under separate management, they do form a news monopoly in the city of Portland. They sorely need competition.

There are some indications that one good which may come out of this very costly strike may be the establishment of a Portland Daily News. Perhaps a new newspaper in our State may become a reality. We need it. And if it is established, it will certainly have my subscription, and I shall do what I can to encourage its establishment. I understand petitions are being circulated in my State seeking the signatures of those who are willing to back the establishment of such a newspaper.

All I wish to say in closing, Mr. President, because I think so many in my State have become weary of the unreasonable policy of the two-headed reactionary Oreganian-Journal, is that we need this proposed new newspaper in my State, and I hope the plans for its development meet with success.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, January 21, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 20, 1960:

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Robert O. Boyd, of Oregon, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1963. (Reappointment.)

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

I nominate the following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeons

Harry F. Colfer
Ralph W. McComas
Donald B. Tower

To be surgeons

David R. Kominz
Edward L. Kuff
Edward J. O'Rourke
Erwin S. Rabeau
Joseph F. Wilson

To be nurse officer

Margaret E. Benson

To be senior assistant surgeons

Thomas A. Waldmann
Stanford B. Friedman
Julian A. Koplen
John E. Venable, Jr.
Paul H. Black
Bertram S. Brown
Robert D. Bahr
William P. Reagan
John V. Petrucci
Robert C. Hoye
James I. Carr, Jr.

To be assistant surgeons

George W. Douglas, Jr.
Gerald R. Bassett
Jack D. Poland

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

John D. Weeks

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Donald P. Dubois — George R. Elmore
James K. Channell — Charles F. Walters
Richard I. Dick — John A. Eure

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

Harold C. Ervine — Clayton L. Sullivan
Robert P. Hangebrauck — Howard P. Zweig
Harvey J. Hansen

To be senior assistant scientist

William H. Lyle, Jr.

To be assistant scientist

John R. Newbrough

To be senior assistant therapist

Martha M. Lasche

To be junior assistant therapist

James D. Ebner

SECTION 5232 APPOINTMENTS

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of such section, I nominate them for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving:

*Joseph C. Burger — *John C. Munn
*Edward W. Snedeker — *Wallace M. Greene, Jr.
*Thomas A. Wornham

*Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 20, 1960:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

John D. Hickerson, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Philippines.

Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Korea.

Edson O. Sessions, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

William P. Snow, of Maine, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Burma.

John J. Muccio, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guatemala.

Edward Page, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bulgaria.

John Ewart Wallace Sterling, of California, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1962, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Robert Bernerd Anderson, of New York, to be a governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey to be an alternate governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

James 4: 10: *Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and He shall lift you up.*

Eternal God, as we turn to Thee in prayer and meditate upon Thy grace and goodness, wilt Thou inspire us with more of gratitude and devotion.

May we now, with one accord, beseech Thee for that needed wisdom which is far beyond our fallible and finite minds but never withheld from any who come unto Thee with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

We pray that Thy Holy Spirit may engender and kindle within us a sincere desire to do Thy bidding with a greater faithfulness and a more determined will.

Grant that neither despair from within nor enemies from without may ever becloud our vision of Thy divine presence with us and Thy beneficent purposes for us.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—AMENDING FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3610) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment work, and for other purposes, disagree to Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BURKE]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BLATNIK, FALLON, JONES of Alabama, MACK of Washington, and CRAMER.

ECONOMIC REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 268)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Economic Committee and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I present herewith my Economic Report, as required by section 3(a) of the Employment Act of 1946.

The report was prepared with the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers and of the heads of the executive departments and independent agencies directly concerned with the matters it discusses. It summarizes the economic developments of the year and the steps taken in major areas of economic policy to promote the sound expansion of employment, production, and income. It also puts forward a program for the year 1960 which, in the context of present and prospective economic conditions, would effectively implement the purposes of the Employment Act.

The major conclusions and recommendations of the report are set forth below, in part in the words of the report itself.

By the first quarter of 1959, the recovery that started early in 1958 had already carried production and income to levels higher than ever before attained in the American economy. A considerable further advance was scored during the remainder of 1959, despite the deep effect of the 116-day strike in the steel industry.

The Nation's output of goods and services in the fourth quarter of 1959 was at an annual rate of $482 billion. When adjusted for price changes, this rate of output was 3½ percent higher than the rate attained in the corresponding period of 1958. By December 1959, total employment had reached a record level, 66.2 million, on a seasonally adjusted basis. And personal income payments in December were at an annual rate of $391 billion, $24 billion greater than a year earlier. After adjustment for increases in prices, the rise in total personal income in 1959 represented a gain of nearly 5 percent in the real buying power of our Nation.

As we look ahead, there are good grounds for confidence that this economic advance can be extended through 1960. Furthermore, with appropriate private actions and public policies, it can carry well beyond the present year.

However, as always in periods of rapid economic expansion, we must avoid speculative excesses and actions that would compress gains into so short a period that the rate of growth could not be sustained. We must seek, through both private actions and public policies, to minimize and contain inflationary pressures that could undermine the basis for a high, continuing rate of growth.

Three elements stand out in the Government's program for realizing the objectives of high production, employment, and income set forth in the Employment Act: first, favorable action by the Congress on the recommendations for appropriations and for measures affecting Federal revenues presented in the budget for the fiscal year 1961; second, use of the resulting surplus, now estimated at $4.2 billion, to retire Federal debt; third, action by the Congress to remove the interest rate limitation that currently inhibits the noninflationary management of the Federal debt. Numerous additional proposals, many of which are described in chapter 4 of the Economic Report, will be made to supplement the

Federal Government's existing economic and financial programs.

Following the budget balance now in prospect for the fiscal year 1960, these three elements of the 1960 program will strengthen and be strengethened by the essential contributions to sustainable economic growth made through the policies of the independent Federal Reserve System. Fiscal and monetary policies, which are powerful instruments for preventing the development of inflationary pressures, can effectively reinforce one another.

But these Government policies must be supplemented by appropriate private actions, especially with respect to profits and wages. In our system of free competitive enterprise and shared responsibility, we do not rely on Government alone for the achievement of inflation-free economic growth. On the contrary, that achievement requires a blending of suitable private actions and public policies. Our success in realizing the opportunities that lie ahead will therefore depend in large part upon the ways in which business management, labor leaders, and consumers perform their own economic functions.

A well-informed and vigilant public opinion is essential in our free society for helping achieve the conditions necessary for price stability and vigorous economic growth. Such public opinion can be an effective safeguard against attempts arbitrarily to establish prices or wages at levels that are inconsistent with the general welfare. Informed public opinion is also necessary to support the laws and regulations that provide the framework for the conduct of our economic affairs.

Further progress is needed in establishing a broad public understanding of the relationships of productivity and rewards to costs and prices. It would be a grave mistake to believe that we can successfully substitute legislation or controls for such understanding. Indeed, the complex relationships involved cannot be fixed by law, and attempts to determine them by restrictive governmental action would jeopardize our freedoms and other conditions essential to sound economic growth.

Our system of free institutions and shared responsibility has served us well in achieving economic growth and improvement. From our past experience, we are confident that our changing and increasing needs in the future can be met within this flexible system, which gains strength from the incentive it provides for individuals, from the scope it affords for individual initiative and action, and from the assurance it gives that Government remains responsive to the will of the people.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 20, 1960.*

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS IN THE DOCUMENT ROOM, OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 340, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1960, until otherwise provided by law, there shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, compensation for the employment of two additional assistants in the document room, office of the Doorkeeper, at the basic salary rate of $2,000 per annum, each; such service to continue until the end of the month during which the Congress adjourns sine die, or recesses, or the fourteenth day after such adjournment or recess, whichever is the later date.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING HOUSE RESOLUTION 136

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 410, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That House Resolution 136, Eighty-sixth Congress, as amended by House Resolution 181, Eighty-sixth Congress, is hereby amended by striking "$475,000" and inserting "$750,000".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 413, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 6, 1960, expenses of conducting the investigations authorized by section 18 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $327,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, investigators, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and which shall also be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees outside the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1, following "1960," insert "the further."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM TO PROVIDE MINIMUM OF SECURITY FOR THE AGED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, any social security pensioner in the United States who is forbidden by law to earn over $1,200 a year—in addition to his old-age benefits—is barely existing.

Here is a strange contradiction.

Nearly a quarter of a century has passed since the Congress made a cautious start on the construction of a social security program. In spite of a gradual extension in coverage, and a number of small increases in benefits, that program has not yet succeeded in providing a genuine minimum of security for the aged.

By writing into the original law a provision stating that a person receiving old-age insurance could earn up to $1,200 in wages each year without jeopardizing his monthly checks, we admitted that the benefits were woefully inadequate.

Depression thinking was also a factor in establishing this rigid ceiling. It was motivated by fears in the 1930's that retired persons would go on working and thus deprive younger people of job opportunities.

That ceiling is completely unrealistic in the light of today's high cost of living.

In a nation that prides itself on initiative, we are denying to older people the right to supplement their meager old-age insurance by continuing to work, even on a job paying less than the minimum wage.

Paradoxically, however, that antiquated provision of the law places no ceiling on other income, such as interest, dividends, and so forth, received by the few who are more fortunately situated than the rank and file of retirees.

I consider this as discrimination against those who are most in need of the opportunity to earn additional income. There should be no ceiling on income received from wages. As long as the Congress will not agree to this, I ask that the present ceiling be raised from $1,200 to $2,400, so that those who must continue to work after retirement will have a reasonable chance to lift themselves from the poverty of social security benefits. Because my bill, H.R. 9460, will not cost a dime, I think that it will be safe from a Presidential veto.

THE IMPENDING THREAT TO AMERICA'S HEALTH

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the mail flowing into my office in recent weeks shows that the American public wants, and expects, action in this session on a problem which threatens the well-being of nearly every American, from the newborn infant to the elderly adult.

That problem is the contamination and pollution of the food, water, and air which sustain the lives of our people.

I am pleased that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has announced that it will begin hearings January 26 on the color additives bill which passed the Senate last year. It is generally understood that the law on food, drug, and cosmetic color additives is outmoded and badly in need of a major overhaul. This legislation very probably will pass the House in this session.

The proposed amendment to the color additives law embodies some beneficial provisions. But I strongly feel the Congress has an obligation, in the face of growing public concern over this problem, to do more than simply to modernize the law on this subject. It must, I feel, begin in dead earnestness to seek a basic approach and solution to the general problem of contamination and pollution of our food, water, and air.

At least two developments have, since the adjournment of the 1959 session, given dramatic focus to this problem.

In November, the warning which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued on contaminated cranberries made front-page headlines in nearly every daily newspaper in the Nation.

Contaminated poultry made headlines in December, when the same Department asked the poultry producers—and the producers agreed—to stop the sales of dressed caponettes which, in being fattened for market, had been treated with pellet injections of an artificial hormone commonly called stilbestrol.

These developments, which sparked widespread public reaction, served to show that the contamination of our food is indeed a serious problem. There have been other manifestations of its seriousness; and still others seem certain to follow.

News Columnist Ed Koterba, in his column carried December 31, 1959, in the Salt Lake Tribune, said the cranberry scare will seem like "small peanuts" besides some of the other examples of chemical contamination which are likely to be exposed in the new year.

Mr. Koterba went on to observe, and I quote:

> Beginning March 7, under a new Federal law, all food chemicals that have not been proved safe by lab test up to then may be removed from grocery shelves. No such tests had been required in the past.
>
> Some food and drug people believe that right now there may be as many as 150 chemicals—possibly many more—which we are now eating that are dangerous to our health.
>
> In the light of this, cranberries, capons, and cosmetics are small fry.
>
> And this is just the beginning.
>
> Within a few months there will be additional revelations about strontium 90, and how this radioactive fallout, which has already been found in milk and wheat, is finding its way into other foods.
>
> In its "man versus environment" conference, the Public Health Service also brought out evidence that even the air we breathe is more dangerous than we have suspected. Research is now under way to determine relationship between air pollution and chronic diseases.
>
> Maybe the scariest handwriting on the food-bin wall comes from a study of drinking water.
>
> Public Health Service studies have so far barely made a bubble on the problem.
>
> One scientist gulped when he looked over the Food and Drug Administration's 10-page typewritten list of crude materials, all potentially dangerous, which could be found in water.
>
> Strangely enough, we can purify ordinary sewage these days, but no adequate methods have been found to make harmless the water that is polluted with these new chemicals.

The menace of air pollution made headlines just this week.

In a front-page story in the Washington Post of January 18, 1960, Dr. Richard A. Prindle, chief of the air pollution medical program in the U.S. Public Health Service, was quoted as saying that air pollution could produce a national disaster.

Dr. Prindle spoke in San Francisco at an air pollution conference sponsored by the University of California, and the Post report of his speech said, in part:

> Dr. Prindle advised his fellow physicians that such air-pollution episodes as that at Donora, Pa., in 1948—in which 20 persons died and 5,910 were made ill—are not the most difficult part of the problem they face. Instead, he said, it is "to understand and help correct the more subtle but nonetheless significant disaster of slow ruination of health and life."
>
> Dr. Prindle noted an increase in diseases "thought to be associated with or caused by air pollution." He listed among them lung cancer, chronic bronchitis, and emphysema.
>
> Even if the amount of air pollution could be held steady, he said, more people would become exposed to risk from lung cancer because more people are moving from the country into the cities. But, he added, air pollution is increasing because the expanding economy and rising need for energy cause more fuels to be burned. Combustion is never complete.
>
> Dr. Prindle presented data indicating that lung cancer kills 11 of 100,000 white male nonsmokers who live in the city, but only 1 of 100,000 living in the country. Among white male smokers he believes, the rate is 65.2 per 100,000 in rural areas and 79 in urban areas.
>
> He said that one can speculate that the higher rate in cities represents, in large part, the contribution of air pollution.
>
> In this connection, he said, that cigarettes and air pollutants may "interact to enhance each other's effect."

Dr. Prindle's remarks make it quite clear that the already distressing menace of degenerative diseases is being magnified by the problem of air pollution.

In my own mind, I have regarded for years the contamination and pollution of our food, water, and air as a serious problem. I strongly felt that it was one of the important problems confronting the Congress in 1959.

Last September, almost 2 months before the cranberry scare swept the country, I wrote and introduced a bill, H.R. 9150, which would establish a National Scientific Commission to make a thorough, independent investigation of food and water contamination and of the roles which additives play in this problem.

The time has arrived, I think, when the Congress ought to be striving consciously to project a national policy on health. The commission which I propose could give the Congress the independent, nonpartisan technical counsel which it needs to shape such policy and translate it into law.

To the American people, the voice of the Federal Government on health must sometimes seem to be that of an uncertain trumpet ringing tremulously in a wilderness of confusion. The absence or inadequacy of policy on health, at the national level, is reflected in the contradictions which characterize the pronouncements of Federal agencies on two topics, tobacco and fluorides.

On tobacco, the Public Health Service has issued public warnings about the association between smoking and lung cancer, while the Department of Agriculture continues to subsidize and encourage the production of tobacco. The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, a Member of the other body, who has repeatedly deplored this inconsistency in Federal policy, once observed:

> What would be the reaction here in America if we learned that the government of Red China was subsidizing the production of poppies, from which opium is distilled. Would we not raise our voices in righteous scorn and indignation? Then what must the rest of the world think of the fact that in the United States eggs and meat and vegetables are not supported as basic farm crops, but tobacco is?

After quoting the warning from Surg. Gen. Leroy E. Burney that independent studies "have confirmed beyond reasonable doubt a high degree of statistical association between lung cancer and prolonged cigarette smoking," the Senator went on to assert:

> Once the Surgeon General had issued such a statement, it seemed to me the height of irony for the Government to continue to regard tobacco as a basic crop. If tobacco is a causative element in spreading the grimmest malady which may plague large numbers of Americans, then the growing of tobacco should not be subsidized out of the taxes collected from the American people.

The contradiction in policies on fluorides has been described in the book, "The American Fluoridation Experiment," published in 1957. The Public Health Service has endorsed fluoridation; yet, as the book observes:

> Under the food and drug law, fluorine is classified as a poison, the use of which in processed foods in any quantity is prohibited.

I want to stress that I am neither an advocate nor an opponent of the practice of fluoridating public water supplies—I stand in complete and sincere neutrality on it. It is my earnest hope that the Scientific Commission which I have proposed would serve to resolve the national controversy which has developed over fluoridation. This, in fact, should be one of the high-priority assignments of such a Commission to make an authoritative, independent determination of whether this practice, now embraced by many American cities and endorsed by the Public Health Service, the American Dental Association, and the American Medical Association, but vigorously opposed by hundreds of distinguished members of the medical and dental professions and by other professional groups,

should or should not be embraced by all the people of this country for the enrichment of their health.

Some observers have suggested that the Commission which H.R. 9150 would establish would, in practice, duplicate the work which Food and Drug Administration is doing. This is not the case. This Commission could help the FDA in at least three ways in which this agency is not fully able to help itself, and do so without duplicating the agency's efforts.

In the first place, it would keep the FDA out of the sometimes awkward position of recommending policy changes and new legislation which the FDA itself would be responsible for enforcing. Second, it would offer a strong, authoritative voice to support some of the controversial moves which the FDA must necessarily make to protect the health and safety of the public. While it is true that the FDA has some excellent scientists directing its inspection and control work and carrying out its research, the Commission which I propose would also be comprised of distinguished scientists with national and international reputations. A controversial move, such as the warning on cranberry contamination, would be less controversial, and would seem less bureaucratic, if it were recommended by such a nonpartisan Commission. Third, this Commission would be in a better position than would the FDA to fight for a larger appropriation for the FDA, which it desperately needs, to enlarge the inadequacies in its current program. It is common knowledge that the FDA is underfinanced and understaffed.

There is a serious inadequacy, for example, in the inspection program on pesticides and insecticides. With its present facilities and manpower, the FDA can run only widely scattered spot inspections on agriculture crops. The vast majority of the raw foods which flow into the Nation's markets and kitchens now are never checked and may carry chemical residues which greatly exceed the tolerances which the FDA is attempting to enforce. Budget requests to enlarge the agency's inspection work have been repeatedly cut, and cut severely.

Moreover, the work of this Commission would actually benefit commercial interests. To illustrate, the crisis recently experienced in the cranberry market, which was a real blow to many a good and conscientious producer, would not have happened if the responsibilities of food producers had been made crystal clear long before these crises could ever have arisen. This proposed Commission would facilitate the realization of this objective.

It would also be my hope that this Commission, being completely unbiased and uninfluenced by commercial interests, might encourage public and private health agencies to extend their research further into fields which may promise very little personal profit, but which may promise much in improved national health. We must extend our horizons in every direction. There are many broad avenues to health. Let no one claim an exclusive monopoly for his particular approach. Diversification of effort must characterize our health program, with increased emphasis upon the importance of nutrition.

I do not suggest that H.R. 9150 is the only approach. My interest in health problems, and in the role which food and water contaminants play in that problem, is not motivated by any pride which I may have in the authorship of this bill. My interest is in seeing something constructive done about the problem. I would happily support any measure which serves that objective.

It well may be that the health problem will not receive the serious, sustained attention it deserves in the Congress until the House or the Senate, or both, establish standing committees on health This is a possibility which, I feel, the 86th Congress would do well to examine carefully. It seemed a step in the right direction when the Federal Government gave full departmental status to the functions combined in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is conceivable that in the future we will see those functions which are administered by this Department realined again, and perhaps separate departments of education, and of health, and of welfare, created.

Moreover, it is quite conceivable that the future will see the Congress establish separate standing committees to keep constant watch on the health of the American people. Meanwhile, I will continue to urge the enactment of H.R. 9150, as a necessary and acceptable immediate approach to the problem.

I am grateful for the support my proposal of a fact-finding Commission has received. Americans in nearly every State and many organizations have written me their support. Communications from the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Health Federation show they want a fact-finding Commission appointed on this problem.

We talk a lot about our competition with Russia, and the retention of our world leadership. It seems to me, however, that keeping up with, or ahead of, the Russians will be rather pointless, if in the meantime we dissipate our national virility and strength, and become a race of coddled and physically corrupted weaklings. Our real success will depend only in part, and a relatively small part, in building better missiles to shoot the moon or our enemies. Of far greater significance will be our ability to live in harmony with the laws of physical, mental, and spiritual health, in order that we might resist the ravages of disease, and achieve the fullness of our creative potential.

In conclusion, I find that I feel less concern over the serious problems which confront us than I feel over the attitudes of the American people toward these problems. The distinguished news analyst, Joseph Alsop, in his column carried last December 2 in the Washington Post, observed, and I quote:

> For surely the real source of America's self-pity and America's self-doubt is a dim but growing sense that we cannot compete in the modern world without somewhat greater efforts and sacrifices. Because of our rich heritage, we can get by with far less effort and far less sacrifice than any other nation. But we cannot grow as we ought to grow, and defend ourselves, and maintain our economic leadership and our political leadership, too, without rather more effort and more sacrifice than we are making now. And the sooner we pull up our socks in the indicated manner, the sooner the wails of self-pity will cease to be heard.

Mr. Alsop, I think, has bitten into the heart of the challenge before us. I hope we will not have to lose our priceless heritage to learn that it is truly priceless. If we are going to remain the foremost civilization of the world, we will have to be just as strong in our desire to hold that position as other dedicated, resourceful nations are in their desire to have it.

STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE: IT'S THE LITTLE THINGS THAT COUNT

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the state of the Union message this year was more than usually interesting. Not so much for its high sentiments of hope for peace, prosperity, and justice, but for its almost total silence on some fields of activity which are inextricably tied into our stature in the world.

In the past a Member could either read the message or listen to it and receive the same impressions. But not so this time.

On at least 18 occasions the President either added new material, deleted significant statements or expressions, or changed language. There is a saying that "It is the little things that count." And since this important annual speech was delivered over a week ago, I have carefully analyzed both the written and the delivered message in an effort to interpret some of the little things, express and implied, that seemed meaningful to me.

As a ranking member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics ever since its formation, I was naturally very much interested and, in fact, pleased to note that the President recognizes the importance of stepping up our space program and that his 1961 budget will call for practically doubling expenditures for space research and development.

But I also have the honor of being a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and chairman of its Oceanography Subcommittee. Through work on that committee and from long prior service on the Armed Services Committee, I have become acutely aware of the importance of the oceans to the security and well-being of the world in general and to that of the United States

in particular. I am a strong believer in the concept of total seapower.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I know something of our needs in and on the oceans. As chairman of our Oceanography Subcommittee, I have been impressed with the fact that "we know more about the back side of the moon than we do about the bottom of the ocean." So I listened eagerly for the President's views on support and development of our posture on and in the oceans.

I was keenly disappointed at his almost complete failure to take any cognizance of this vital area of concern to this country, an area in which our military and our scientists have shown we are rapidly losing way in the competition for total seapower. Though plugging for step-up in space activity, no reference at all was made to the recommendation of the National Academy of Sciences for a coordinated program of intensified oceanographic research. Nor was there any reference to strengthening our failing merchant marine or the growing problems in our increasingly important fisheries. And little reference was made to our Navy.

I said I was keenly disappointed at the omission of reference to some of these matters. But perhaps, in view of the very general nature of most state of the Union messages, it would be unreasonable to expect the President to make direct reference to every aspect of our national life and programs requiring support.

Upon listening to the delivered speech in comparison to the prepared text, I became frankly disturbed to note an apparently concerted effort to write off and to ignore the very existence of the oceans or anything suggestive thereof. Well, yes, there was enough reference to "oceans" left in the message to float our nuclear submarines—but not enough to ascertain the existence of undersea obstacles they might meet. For example, as delivered there were three very ominous, it seemed to me, and obviously deliberate emendations from the preprepared message—three of only four references, direct or indirect, substantive or rhetorical, to the water area that comprises more than 70 percent of the earth's surface.

I will cite these three instances:

First. On page 6 of the prepared text the President made the reassuring statement that "The deployment of a portion of these—our—forces beyond our shores, on land and sea, is pursuasive demonstration of our determination to stand shoulder to shoulder with our allies for collective security."

A good statement. But I wonder why the deliberate omission in the delivered speech of "on land and sea"?

Second. Then again, on page 9, after very rightly cautioning us against permitting the advance of inflation, he eliminated the sentence reading "inflation's ravages do not end at the water's edge."

Now I cannot help but wonder why this seemingly innocuous reference to water should be deleted.

Third. Then again, on page 12 of the prepared text, the President would have said:

> We live, moreover, in a sea of semantic disorder in which old labels no longer faithfully describe.

I believe I subscribe to the statement, to the extent that I can understand it. But am I paranoid to wonder why the word "storm" was substituted for the word "sea" in the delivered address? Am I sick to see something sinister or significant in such semantic antics as the sudden substitution of sibilants in a simple simile?

When the President speaks to the Congress on the state of the Union, it is surely proper to assume that he says nothing without a purpose. The same must apply to such unequivocal modifications of the distributed prepared text.

So I fear for the future of some of our naval, merchant marine, fishery and oceanographic programs. I predict that a study of the budget for 1961 will bear out these misgivings.

In any event, the President certainly squeezed all the water out of what was already a rather dry address.

INFLATION AND THE EMERGENCY HOMEOWNERSHIP BILL

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in addressing the House this morning is to call to the Members' attention, with justifiable pride, the actions of the Home Builders Association of Chicago in properly understanding the inflationary abuses of the so-called emergency homeownership bill. Innocent-sounding titles such as this are too often used to cover legislative proposals which are, in the long run, detrimental to the interest of homeowners, taxpayers, and all Americans. Inflation is today the greatest danger our country faces. Fantastic spending proposals with their roots in the welfare-state philosophy of government are detrimental to the stability of the American economy, and I am gratified that the Chicago homebuilders, with their tremendous reputation for civic responsibility, have seen fit to boldly oppose this new proposal for massive Federal spending under the name of a nonexistent emergency.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Jan. 19, 1960]

BUILDERS WIN FIGHT AGAINST FEDERAL AID—CHICAGOANS HIT INFLATION BILL

Chicago area home builders were successful Monday in their initial efforts to prevent the National Association of Home Builders from endorsing a program to seek special financial aid from the Federal Government.

Kimball Hill, past president, and Ralph Finitzo, president of the Home Builders Association of Chicagoland, said that appropriation of $1 billion to the Federal National Mortgage Association as proposed in the Rains bill before Congress would be inflationary.

The measure has been urged by builders in the southern and western parts of the United States, where the supply of mortgage money has dwindled and interest rates have risen to 7 percent.

TABLED UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Monday the national association's directors voted to table the issue until Wednesday. The vote was close but the victors were confident the result would stand if another vote comes Wednesday.

The Rains bill was introduced by Representative ALBERT RAINS, Democrat, of Alabama, who was a speaker at the national association's annual convention in the Conrad Hilton Hotel.

A TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE GORDON CANFIELD WHO WILL RETIRE UNDEFEATED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Representative GORDON CANFIELD, of Paterson, N.J., will voluntarily retire from Congress at the end of this year to enjoy a well-earned rest.

He came to Congress in 1941 to represent the people of the Eighth New Jersey District. From his very first day in this House, he has compiled an admirable record of intelligence, integrity, and human understanding in behalf of his constituents and the Nation.

GORDON is an around-the-clock Congressman who never spared himself when others needed him. Always in close touch with the people and the problems of his district, he earned the respect and the affection of Republicans, Democrats and independents alike.

As a public servant he is invincible, because no man could do more for the people he represented.

As a colleague he won our esteem for his courage and devotion to the highest ideals of representative government.

His superhuman labors affected his health, and led to the reluctant decision to retire at the end of 1960. Our thanks and best wishes go with him at the conclusion of his brilliant career as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. We sincerely hope that he will enjoy many years of fulfillment in the less-strenuous program that opens up before him.

Our regard for him is best summed up in the December 16, 1959, editorial of the Paterson News, titled "GORDON CANFIELD Retires and the District Loses a Champ." Under unanimous consent I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to insure permanent recognition of his outstanding service as a Member of Congress.

The editorial follows:

GORDON CANFIELD RETIRES AND THE DISTRICT LOSES A CHAMP

Things won't be the same in Passaic County politics from here on in—at least in the even years of congressional elections.

GORDON CANFIELD has been the Congressman from this Eighth District through a generation and only the youngish oldtimer will be able to recall that it was his boss, the late George N. Seger, who was his predecessor. That was 20 years ago.

Thus for well nigh two decades CANFIELD has served us in Washington, and as a public servant and as a Republican candidate every 2 years, he was a veritable champion. In the Republican heydays and in the lean years when the magic name of Franklin D. Roosevelt was cutting down Republicans, the people remembered GORDON CANFIELD'S beneficences and he was always top man on his ticket. Some good candidates fell by the wayside before the CANFIELD juggernaut.

The answer was Congressman CANFIELD'S dedicated service, and in truth, it was this around-the-clock devotion which has finally determined him to retire from the political wars. To have continued in the only way he knows how to campaign or to serve in office might have permanently impaired his health.

So who can quarrel with his decision not to run again in spite of the void he will leave and the heart tug his decision to retire inspires? He has certainly earned the right to call it a day as a candidate after 37 years in Washington.

What was the secret of Congressman CANFIELD'S unmatched success? It was being with and for people. It could just as well have been coined in his name when it was said that to have a friend one must be a friend.

Just a few years ago, an overexuberant Democratic candidate, seeking to probe the CANFIELD success secret, came up with the bombastic charge that all the Congressman had to offer was his friendship for the little man. That did it, touched off such an atomic indignation among the rank and file of the voters that the ingenious candidate was snowed under.

The little man was there at the polls to vote for his friend. It has always been so—no letter unanswered, no opportunity for service ignored. Thousands knew his friendly intercession, his always solicitous concern for the people of his district.

During World War II, Congressman CANFIELD became restive at home. So he shipped abroad a freighter, made the rounds of the camps where his hometown boys were serving, comforted them, brought messages back to anxious loved ones. He braved the dangers of the sea, walked in the historical London blitz, was horrified at the Nazi slaughterhouse in Buchenwald. Here was one man who knew firsthand what he talked about to his people, and they believed in him.

In Congress, Mr. CANFIELD stood up and was counted. He was one of the first to warn of the threat of communism, because he had seen its creeping infection spreading when he was in Europe. He fought for proper defenses, for recognition of missile preparedness. He alone of all Republican candidates was endorsed by labor which constantly was on the Democratic side.

But he was no rubberstamp for any man or any cause. He had courage.

And so when GORDON CANFIELD decides now he cannot rally the strength of another vigorous campaign with all its exactions, when he feels he would like to nestle home with his faithful family and rest a bit on the laurels he has earned, who among us will say him nay?

The Eighth District yields him to the inexorability of time only in Congress.

There will be other opportunities for service for this man of decency, integrity, and dedication.

Meantime, all people of good will, regardless of politics, will wish him well as he begins his final year of service in Congress, and among these the News is happy to be counted as delighted that through all his years of matchless service, we were his stanch and unremitting supporters.

Of him it will be said with truth: "Well done thou true and faithful servant."

AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1956 the Congress established a new program of disability benefits for persons aged 50 and over. It was described as a conservative plan designed to test the feasibility as to cost and administration of insuring against this type of risk in a public program. Because of this approach, the bill included a very strict definition of total and permanent disability, and the minimum age for benefits was set at age 50.

We have now had almost 4 years of experience with the plan. And we have learned from recent and extensive hearings conducted in November by the Ways and Means Subcommittee on the Administration of the Social Security Laws that the disability system has been a successful experiment and that it is financially sound.

The bill I introduce today would further strengthen this program by making benefits available to workers at any age, by giving some reality to the definition of disability as it applies to elderly disabled people and by providing insurance benefits to widows and widowers who are totally disabled. I would like to comment on each of these provisions in turn.

In a recent press release, the Honorable BURR HARRISON, chairman of this subcommittee, stated that he sees no reason to continue the exclusion of persons under 50, which he called an arbitrary and discriminating requirement. He added:

> A man, for example, aged 35 or 40, who is the sole support of a growing family and becomes disabled, faces as great a hardship as does the disabled person who at 50 years of age is more likely to have fewer dependents.

By removing the present limitation which pays benefits only to men and women 50 years of age and over, my bill would make eligible for benefits some 100,000 workers below that age, who have now qualified for the freeze. In addition, it is estimated that another 25,000 workers who have not applied for the freeze would apply for benefits together with around 100,000 dependents of the disabled workers. The rehabilitation features built into the present system would be far more important for this younger group of workers than they have been so far for older workers. Indeed, I believe that one of the most important features of this change would be the effect it would have of bringing these disabled younger workers into contact with rehabilitation facilities.

Of like importance, to my mind, is the strict definition of disability.

Since July 1957, when disability benefits first went into effect, it has become apparent that this strict definition has been administered even more strictly. I would venture to say that every Member here present has, at one time or another, had letters from constituents who, although clearly unable to work, have been held not to be disabled under the law. Such a strict definition works a particular hardship in the case of a man or woman approaching retirement age—a period when opportunities for employment for even the most ablebodied are very remote.

The bill I introduce today is a step in giving some reality to the definition of "disability" as it applies to these people. It would establish an occupational definition of "disability" which would be applicable to workers who have attained the age of 60. These older workers must now meet the admittedly tough requirement of the act by showing that they are unable to engage "in any substantial gainful activity"—which means, according to the Social Security Administration, that if a 60-year-old disabled lumberjack in my district could theoretically work as a pecan sheller in Georgia, he is thereby disqualified from benefits.

My bill would modify this definition by providing that a 60-year-old worker could qualify if he was unable to "engage in any substantial gainful activity which is the same or similar to that of his usual occupation or employment." I point out that this is not a new or untried concept from the standpoint of administration. Occupational definitions of disability appear in the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Act, as well as in State workmen's compensation, temporary disability, and staff retirement legislation.

Limiting the occupational definition to age 60 has the following advantages: First, it pinpoints the problem of the older disabled worker who has little chance or opportunity of becoming rehabilitated so that he can perform another job. Of those workers referred to State vocational rehabilitation agencies under the disability program of the Social Security Act, less than 5 percent accepted for rehabilitation have been aged 60 or over and only a small proportion of these are actually rehabilitated. To rehabilitate an individual aged 60 or over for employment requires expense, time, and effort which many consider not to be justified in view of the relatively short period before his retirement, and the fact that his reemployment often can be accomplished only under sheltered work conditions. However much we may engage in wishful thinking as to the potentialities of rehabilitation, the hard fact is that the limitation of trained staff for rehabilitation programs means they cannot be expected to concentrate their efforts on older men and women at the expense of younger people with families.

Moreover, my proposal faces up realistically to the fact that, although theoretically it might be possible for these people to, perhaps, do light work in another line of employment, their chances of getting such work are negligible. All evidence, and good commonsense, suggests that their chances of getting

any job at all are extremely remote. For most of us the time is past when, in an agricultural environment, our work life could be tapered off with light chores. A form of hard-core unemployment is developing even among our able-bodied older men and women who are unable to get jobs once they are laid off. This situation has been accentuated during the past few decades because more people are living longer. The call for handicraft skills is decreasing at a time when the expansion of machine technology is discarding many of the skills developed during a lifetime.

For these reasons, numerous bills have appeared to lower the retirement age for social security purposes to age 60. Such a proposal would help to relieve the hardships of the workers I have described but it would be very costly to social security plan. And a large part of that cost would go toward paying benefits to the most fortunate people of all—those who are financially able to retire early.

I believe, therefore, that the basic solution is not just an early retirement age but more flexibility in the retirement age concept by making benefits available to those men and women who, through factors beyond their control, have been retired by a disabling condition. We know that the onset and extent of crippling diseases rises rapidly after middle age. We know that a man 60 or more may be the victim of a slowly disabling ailment which, while it does not yet meet the strict definition in existing law, precludes the possibility of work. And, if able-bodied people at this age are unable to find jobs, how can our social security plan continue to deny benefits to disabled workers on the ground that they could work if someone would hire them?

The third provision of this bill is the extension of insurance benefits to widows and widowers who are totally disabled. Under the present law, such benefits are available only at age 62 for widows and at age 65 for widowers. It seems to me that the philosophy of the legislation as it now stands presumes that widows and widowers below this age, assuming that they do not have minor children to care for, are able to meet the loss of the family breadwinner by seeking employment themselves. This is undoubtedly true for most widows and widowers, but what of those who are physically unable to work? Under the present law they must wait for survivors benefits until they have reached age 62, or, in the case of widowers, age 65. This can be a long and heartbreaking wait and I feel sure that most, if not all, of the Members of this House have, like myself, received letters from constituents who find themselves in this situation. Since 1956 we have recognized the need for assistance of disabled workers. Can we, in good conscience, ignore the same need on the part of those who have lost the working member of the family but are unable to replace him themselves? I do not see how we can.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I present today builds on our past experience with the social security program. It does not propose any radical departures from current philosophy, but instead strengthens the program so that it better meets the needs of our people. Two of the proposals I am making relate to changes which Chairman MILLS, of the House Ways and Means Committee, has indicated as worthy of consideration, in his opinion. I believe that this bill presents a reasonable and equitable way of meeting the very real hardship which is now being experienced by older men and women who have been turned away from the door of the social security office because they were adjudged to be not quite sick enough or crippled enough to qualify under the law as it is now written; by younger workers whose disability is no less of a personal disaster because they don't happen to be 50 yet; and by younger widows and widowers who cannot now qualify for benefits because they have not established coverage under the law but who are unable to do so because of their physical disability. I hope that this proposal will receive the careful consideration which I believe it deserves.

THE CHALLENGE OF PRESERVING PEACE: THE SEVEN DYNAMIC SPEARHEADS OF PEACE POWER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California, in the second speech of this series, outlined the Sino-Soviet peril to peace and freedom. Now I ask: In the decade of the 1960's, can we meet this dire peril?

Can we preserve a peace based on justice?

Can we move even one step beyond and enlarge freedom throughout the world?

We can. But, I firmly believe that we will, only if we remold seven dynamic spearheads of peace power, the very spearheads which the Republicans already have used to preserve peace since 1953. Because the peril has deepened, these spearheads must be continually sharpened.

First. The first of these spearheads is a consistent and firm American foreign policy designed to clarify our vital commitments in advance, in order that no opponent will be drawn into war through miscalculations.

Twice in this century the absence of such positive diplomacy has produced wars. In 1908, when conflict between Austro-Hungary and Serbia was imminent, Russia backed down on its obligations to come to the aid of Serbia. In 1914, when a similar crisis developed Austro-Hungary expected Russia to back down again. But Russia did not. Thus, the way to World War I was paved by the Austro-Hungary miscalculation of Russia's position.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] noted in the previous speech, the American Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, in 1950 outlined the perimeter which America would defend in the Far East. Korea was excluded. Therefore, the Communists calculated that the United States would not intervene if they attacked South Korea.

Here, then, are examples of two prolonged wars, bred in an atmosphere of miscalculation. Had diplomats made clear, in advance, the positions of their countries, war could have been prevented.

Apparently, Russians today recognize all-out war as nuclear suicide. If so, the most likely possibility of nuclear war during the decade we have just entered would be through Russia miscalculating. That could occur if Soviet leaders believed that, when confronted with the brink of war, an administration in Washington would retreat.

Consequently, we must never introduce into our foreign policy ambiguities and appearances of softness and domestic divisions which might spark the Communists into a miscalculation that could fuse a war.

Today, Russia knows the United States cannot be bluffed or blackmailed. Throughout the decade ahead we must continue to have a President, Vice President, and Secretary of State, who understand the Soviet strategy and who will not employ defensive and ambiguous policies.

Is there a difference between the approaches of the Democratic Advisory Council and the Republicans to this area of foreign policy?

Unfortunately the same differences the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] noted in his speech exist today. The Democratic Advisory Council and its spokesmen, Adlai Stevenson and Dean Acheson, make statements which often give Red Russia and Red China the picture of a divided America with ambiguous will and zig-zagging diplomacy. Apparently they want to stand up to the Communists on one issue, but not on the next.

We Republicans shall always abhor this attitude. For we believe it breeds miscalculations.

Second. The second dynamic spearhead of peace power is an effective, flexible, military deterrent system. It must employ a secure retaliatory capacity to respond vigorously at places and with means of our own choosing.

There has developed an increasing tendency among critics of the administration to judge our deterrent capacity purely in arithmetical terms using only a part rather than the whole of our deterrent or retaliatory capability for comparative purposes. This defensive attitude of trying to match and copy everything Russia does would leave the initiative with Russia. In contrast, we must look to the total deterrent force in being and planned to determine our real military posture.

In order to reverse the pronounced Communist successes throughout the world, the Eisenhower administration inaugurated a new foreign policy which was the antithesis of the containment strategy of the previous administration.

As was noted in the previous speech, containment had resulted in the United

States trying to spread its ground strength around the world so thinly that it became ineffective. During this same period, we had a virtual atomic monopoly. Yet, so poorly was this source of potential strength integrated into our foreign policy that Communist aggression abounded.

Vice President NIXON explained the plight of the new administration when it took office in 1953:

> We found that economically their [the Russians] plan, apparently, was to force the United States to stay armed to the teeth, to be prepared to fight anywhere—anywhere in the world—that they, the men of the Kremlin chose.

The solution of the new administration was expressed by Mr. Dulles:

> The way to deter aggression is for the free community to be willing and able to respond vigorously at places and with means of its own choosing.

This policy demanded a reshaping of our military forces in order to obtain a mobile retaliatory capacity. Many administration critics were slow, however, to grasp the true implications of this new strategy. They still do not understand it. They insist on saying that the term "massive mobile retaliatory capacity" envisions exclusively atomic retaliation aimed at cities like Moscow or Peiping.

They maintain that Mr. Dulles inaugurated a one-weapon strategy, an all-or-nothing-at-all approach. Ironically, his critics attack, for political reasons, a policy which they fabricated for attack, a strawman which exists only in their own thinking, a ghost of their imaginations which never existed in the thinking of the State Department and the White House.

Mr. Dulles often explained the fallacy of such an interpretation. For example, in a 1954 article published in Foreign Affairs, the late Secretary of State noted that the new policy, in relation to Korea, did not mean that renewed Communist aggression would result in the United Nations dropping atomic bombs on Peiping or Moscow. It did mean that we will respond, not defensively, but with initiative, at times and places of our own choosing.

Of course, we will never alert an opponent in advance to the particular weapon or the particular place we will respond. Keeping him guessing as to the means—whether we would use naval forces, conventional land forces, tactical atomic weapons, or what—is part of the psychology of our deterrence. But we will make crystal clear our aim to defend an area through an initiative which allowed no privileged sanctuaries. Manchuria in the Korean war was a privileged sanctuary.

If is unfortunate indeed if the constant literature produced about so-called massive retaliation beclouds the true strategy of the present administration. That strategy of the present administration ended the Korean war. It deterred war in the Formosa area. It foiled Communist designs on West Berlin. Throughout the decade ahead, this same strategy of initiative can preserve the peace.

It involves a system of deterrence where our entire arsenal—from conventional to the most unconventional weapons—is combined with just the right selectivity to apply force exactly calculated to check the specific case of aggression.

Throughout the 1960's, our responses must be affirmative—not just negative and defensive. Our vision must be forward-looking and sensitive to the constantly changing weapons of our military system. Our perspective must consider the intrarelationship of our deterrent system. The energy for our national security must not be wasted on duplication and overconcentration of what is no longer essential.

When it becomes necessary to increase the proportionate share of budget spending to maintain this type of security, the American people, through curtailment of subsidy and nondefense spending programs, must make personal sacrifices. We can afford the defense we need. But we Republicans believe that we must afford it through sacrifice, and not through deficit spending.

Democrats like those in their advisory council want to afford that defense through charging it to the next generation and bankrupting their freedom. With splintered vision, they want to build up our missile defenses by lowering our economic defenses.

Third. And this leads us to consider our next spearhead of peace power—a strong, free, and rapidly growing American economy.

On May 24, 1957, Khrushchev pronounced:

> We do not intend to blow up the capitalist world with bombs. If we catch up with the United States in per capita production of meat, butter and milk we will have hit the pillar of capitalism with the most powerful torpedo yet.

The gentleman from California—speech No. 2—described how the Eisenhower policy of using with initiative the total potentialities of our strength ended the Korean war and blocked major aggression by Communists since. As a result, the Communists have shifted their major hopes to an economic offensive.

Their success will depend to a large degree upon the fiscal policies and productive forces within America. For at the base of this Soviet-American economic conflict is the ruble versus the dollar. The fundamentals of the conflict are not new to the Communists. Lenin said:

> The best way to destroy the capitalist system is to debauch the currency.

Plainly, Communist theorists believe that eventually democratic nations will debauch their own currency. Thereseems to be a mounting danger of this Communist expectation turning into a reality within America.

Our impoverished oversea neighbors, however, have learned through bitter experience an economic lesson in survival. They have adopted balanced budgets and sound economic policies which have produced unprecedented prosperity. The austerity program in England has yielded budget surpluses and a 6 percent tax cut. Because of hard money policies in France, her economic stability has greatly increased. The Common Market has accelerated Europe's overall economic rise. Japan is enjoying swift recovery and booming industries. And the economic growth of West Germany equals that of Red Russia.

And how do these countries view the United States? I quote from some remarks of William McChesney Martin, Jr.

> To the foreigner, much more than to Americans, the dollar is a symbol of this country's strength. A decline in the value of the dollar would suggest to him a decline in the faith and credit of the United States; signaling in his mind a decline not only in American economic strength but also in moral force.

As we enter the 1960's the Democratic Advisory Council and liberal Democrats in Congress still scoff at the economic laws which are producing fiscal health overseas. They vigorously oppose efforts to balance the budget.

What makes their complacency over fiscal policies so perilous?

The industrial revolution, which reached its peak years ago in the United States, is just going into full swing in many areas abroad. Especially is this true in the Iron Curtain countries where the labor force has been reduced to slavery.

This cheap labor market becomes an acute factor in East-West trade competition, since in the United States wages often climb more rapidly than profits. Thus, the final cost of our products has priced us out of many foreign markets. This places us at a disadvantage in a trade war with Russia. Must we add to this the handicap of a decadent dollar?

Because of the importance of the dollar in our foreign policy, fiscal soundness at home has become essential in meeting the Communist peril abroad. This and the other economic essentials will be treated in more detail in a subsequent speech of this series.

Fourth. The fourth dynamic spearhead of peace power is collective security and solidarity throughout the free world. Mr. Herter said recently:

> Our greatest advantage in the world struggle is that we are not alone. Many countries are with us wholeheartedly and confidently. Many others are with us in spirit, even though they cannot say so.

To maintain this advantage, we must continue to foster our collective security system. In certain respects, this system is an economy measure, for it enables our allies to supplement our own military forces.

The numerous bases in those friendly countries not only provide needed facilities for our air and naval forces, but also afford us missile sites. This dispersion of bases throughout the world makes it impossible for Soviet aircraft and missiles to destroy our retaliatory capacity.

The other vital military contribution of our allies is in terms of manpower. The United States is able to devote primary emphasis to strategic striking forces, to missiles, and to space developments because of this supplementary manpower. So, our conventional war strength can be only partly appraised in terms of U.S. Army combat divisions. It can be fully evaluated in terms of the allied divisions our forces support and train. The technical, logistical, and mis-

sile capabilities perform a vital function for numerous military assistance groups and provide tactical support to many allies.

Paradoxically, many representatives of the opposition have shouted that our Army divisional strength is too small, and then have voted to cut mutual security funds and hence the Army divisional strength of our allies, which comes at less cost to us in dollars and American manpower.

At the same time, our entire foreign aid program must be subject to periodic reappraisal. A decade ago the economy of many of our major allies was in a depressed state, and this required us to bear the major burden of both military and general economic aid to the free world. We rejoice in the startling recovery that many of those allies have made, and we call upon them to accept their full share of responsibility in fostering both the defense and economic health of the free world.

As a result of economic transactions with other countries last year, the United States had a deficit in balance payments of about $3¾ billion. Why has this deficit resulted? We have an annual expenditure of about $3 billion to maintain our military forces overseas. Our loans, grants, and capital outflow that increase our exports amount to about $2 billion annually, and we have a private capital investment outflow of about $2 billion a year. Obviously, it is necessary to our economic health that the prosperous free nations bear more of the burden in maintaining efficient defenses, of encouraging private investment and in assisting the less developed areas.

Solidarity of the free world involves more than just the economic aspect. It has a psychological and diplomatic side, too.

It is indeed tragic that the leading foreign policy spokesman of the Democratic advisory council, Mr. Dean Acheson, seems to berate our efforts to promote moral solidarity throughout the world. On the eve of the President's departure for an unprecedentedly long and strenuous trip among our many allies and friends, Mr. Acheson publicly said that little good would come from the trip. While the President tries to promote unity, Acheson seems to promote disunity. Has he no awareness of the importance attached to statements of a former Secretary of State?

Will he never learn a lesson? About a year ago he was the principal author of an advisory council pamphlet which painted a picture of disunity within the free world and claimed that our position in the world and our alliances were dissolving "as just a hundred years ago men watched the Union dissolve under the weak and palsied hand of Buchanan." The release of this vindictive pamphlet was timed to coincide with the week that the NATO ministers were meeting in Washington to reaffirm unity and solidarity. The Berlin crisis had begun, and it was necessary to our diplomacy to present Khrushchev with the picture of a united NATO. And yet, the Democratic advisory council used its efforts to propagandize the line of disunity.

When supporting and promoting collective security and solidarity among our allies, both political parties should make a constructive contribution. During the 1960's, we call upon responsible Democrats to do something, somehow, to control these nonconstructive spokesmen of their advisory council. Indeed, we sympathize with those Members on the other side of the aisle who deplore this irresponsibility.

The dilemmas of their party disunity, however, in no way relieve them from the duty to curtail this council when its members jeopardize unity in our defenses against the Sino-Soviet peril. For, in the decade ahead, cooperation among our political parties to promote allied unity will be as important as cooperation among the allies themselves.

Fifth. Science and technology is the fifth spearhead of peace power which we must vastly sharpen.

The deepest peril we face is that the Russians will concentrate on a few given, but quite decisive, areas and develop superior technological skills. In the area of rocket technology, we have seen what they have accomplished in outer space. This did not happen by luck. They had enormous vision and great drive. By 1947, the rocket theories of the German scientist, Sanger, had created a tidal wave of excitement in the Kremlin.

So that a top priority could be set up for the rocket program, Stalin ordered an aerodynamics expert, Col. Gugori Tokaev, to his office. Tokaev, who later defected, said that the Kremlin leaders were in almost a hysterical clamor for greater details about a super rocket. Neither were the diplomatic implications of this technological adventure lost on Stalin. He told Tokaev that the rocket "would make it easier to talk to the gentleman shopkeeper, Truman."

As Dr. von Braun pointed out at the time Russia shot up her first sputnik:

> The United States had no ballistic missile program worth mentioning between 1945 and 1951. * * * These 6 years, during which the Russians obviously laid the groundwork for their large rocket program, are irretrievably lost.

At the outset of the 1960's, we must launch into this field of technology with renewed determination to make up for the lost years. We must surpass Russia. Erratic programing and crash measures are not the answer. Clear lines of leadership, however, are essential. And I hail it as a great step forward that all space projects, including the brilliant team of Dr. von Braun, have now been placed under the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The news that the Saturn project may cut 2 years from Russia's lead time is most heartening.

In the decade ahead, however, we must meet a much broader challenge yet in the fields of science and technology. Many spokesmen of the Democratic Advisory Council appear to advocate responses which exclusively involve greater appropriations of money and greater bureaucratic controls. Paradoxically, Russia has made profound progress in science and technology because in this area she abandoned Marxian centralism and control and inaugurated freedom and incentive. Did not Khrushchev, during his visit to America, boast to the President that Russia used incentives more extensively than did the United States?

In contrast to the approach of the Democratic Advisory Council, the Percy Committee Report emphasized that there are three essentials to the creation of a strong science and technology:

> The maintenance of an environment of freedom and public understanding in which creativity can flourish.
>
> The maintenance of a superior educational system which stresses the value of excellence for its own sake and which makes a special effort to search out the most gifted minds, wherever found, and to make available to them the most advanced training which they are capable of absorbing.
>
> The provision of scientists and engineers with the economic resources with which to pursue their search with the utmost aggressiveness.

This approach will indeed grant our Nation a new lease on its heritage, and a renewed faith in its capacity.

And this leads to a consideration of the next dynamic spearhead.

Sixth. The sixth dynamic spearhead of peace power is the increased use of the psychological, moral, and spiritual resources of a free society.

The Communists have made a god of Karl Marx and a religion of scientific materialism. Undoubtedly, the Marxian gospel exploits the weaknesses of human nature. Its breeding ground is in discontent and in frustrated hopes.

So, we are dealing with a dangerous peril, one involving far more deadly consequences than just missiles, military strategy, and geographical battlefields. The peril is not solely from without. It threatens from within as well. It will prey on our every lack of faith in ourselves.

During this age of conflict, the decisive battleground will be in the minds of men.

The static lie of Russian communism can be met only by the dynamic truth of American freedom. Unfortunately, many Americans have not awakened to the basis of the big lie even within their own country. The big lie is found in the materialistic interpretation of man and man's destiny. Of this, communism is merely a ruthless manifestation. This materialism is often called, simply, socialism. Our ideas and faith can never be victorious over Communistic ideas through a greater application of materialism, statism, and socialism.

I fear that the Democratic advisory council exerts an influence to convert our foreign policy into a materialistic program, to purge it of all principle. Is this not a repetition of the pattern of allowing the Soviet to control the initiative and to choose the framework for conflict?

A strong faith and ideology within America is essential. It is just as essential to carry it to the Russian people themselves. This leads to the next force.

Seventh. The seventh dynamic spearhead of peace power is a people-to-people approach. The Vice President's visit to Soviet Russia last summer was a creative, dynamic, and timely breakthrough of the Soviet Iron Curtain. I say it was creative because it challenged the Communists as never before into a contest of ideas. I say it was dynamic for it was a giant step forward toward a long-standing aim of the Eisenhower foreign policy of liberating minds and restoring freedom within the Sino-Soviet bloc.

The Percy report has splendidly summed up our policy of liberation:

> Our policy of nonviolent emancipation, with its longrun perspectives, would spell out the policy of peaceful liberation which some have either not understood or deliberately distorted out of all proportions. The emancipation policy promises to establish much-needed facilities for the peaceable creation of pressures for gradual expansion of freedom within the Communist empire.

During his visit to Russia, Vice President NIXON superbly dramatized American superiority in the production of consumer goods. Granted, much of what he said never got to the Russian masses. But some of what he said had a marked effect. A continued program of this nature, with increased cultural and scientific exchanges will bring to the Russian people and to the satellites the American story of the benefits from a free economy. In turn, this story will create upward pressures on the Soviet rulers. This could deter Soviet aggression and expand freedom within Russia and her satellites.

The follow-up to the initial people-to-people approach has been the personal diplomacy of President Eisenhower. For some time before his death, Secretary of State Dulles had pointed out to the President his tremendous prestige throughout the world. The time might come, insisted Dulles, for the President to use fully this prestige and influence through a series of tours. Obviously, it would have been a cardinal blunder to embark in this personal diplomacy at the wrong time. But was the time not ideal, before a summit meeting, toward the end of the President's term in office? This would further steal the initiative from Mr. Khrushchev. It would cast the setting for the conflict where we want it—in the arena of world opinion—that would make it a battle of ideas and not of missiles.

The casual observer will ask: Have not some of the members of the Democratic Advisory Council been calling for a summit meeting year after year? And is the Republican leadership not now taking us to a summit? So is there any difference in attitudes in this particular regard?

Most certainly, yes. The difference is in timing and in preparation. Yalta and Potsdam were failures. We tried a summit in 1955 and it became clearly evident that Khrushchev was not yet thoroughly convinced that the Eisenhower administration had irrevocably inaugurated a new foreign policy which would not bow to blackmail and to duplicity.

It took four more years to educate the Soviet leaders, during crisis after crisis, that the new administration would not compromise vital issues. And the final part of Khrushchev's education was during the Berlin crisis of 1959. He gave America a deadline. He was determined to humiliate us into a summit, when the entire world knew it was blackmail. America stood her ground, despite the fact that a former Truman advisor, George Kennan, declared we should withdraw from Europe altogether.

Khrushchev's education was complete. He realized that he was confronted with a new foreign policy, far different from that of the Truman administration. He had the alternative of plunging his country into an all-out war, or seeking a peaceful means of competition. At this decisive moment, the President took the initiative. He sought to avoid a condition mentioned in the speech of the gentleman from California—speech No. 2—where a Soviet leader might see no way out, feel that he was boxed in, and irrationally tumble toward war. Without retreating from the Berlin issue, Mr. Eisenhower invited Mr. Khrushchev to the United States. Thus the Soviet Chairman, at the decisive moment, was led toward the ways of peaceful competition. The timing of our President was brilliant.

Now we do hold the initiative.

The greatest single challenge of the 1960's is to bring the people-to-people approach closer and closer to every member of the Communist empire. This policy, however, can backfire if executed by unskilled men with limited ability and limited vision.

We must continue to have as President, Vice President and Secretary of State, leaders with judgment and knowledge of world affairs. The future of this country—indeed, the future of freedom throughout the world—cannot be risked, either to rank amateurs in international relations, or to those who produced the ambiguous and faltering diplomacy of the late 1940's.

As we enter the decade of the 1960's a profound difference emerges between the foreign-policy approaches of the Republicans and of the Democratic Advisory Council. Basically, it is this: While the Republicans are looking forward, members of the Democratic Advisory Council, the Stevensons and the Achesons, are looking backward. Against the Russian peril, they still do not understand the need for a consistent, clear policy of firmness. They have splintered vision, and see the Soviet peril only in parts. Their reactions are defensive.

The Republicans undertook the campaign of 1952 with two important foreign-policy aims—to end the war in Korea and to initiate a policy of liberation. Peace in Korea, the Republicans knew, could only come from reshaping a policy of the initiative which outlawed the privileged sanctuary. Liberation of those in Soviet slavedom could only come by maneuvering the Russian leaders into a climate of exchange of ideas, culture, and competition in consumer production.

This year the Republicans undertake another campaign. More than just political, it is a campaign to promulgate a philosophy for maintaining peace with justice and extending freedom here and throughout the world.

We have summed up this policy for the 1960's in terms of seven spearheads of peace power. Not just one, but all seven are needed to spearhead the progress of freedom throughout the world.

Why is the Republican Party capable of promoting this dynamic policy? Because as a party it possesses the four qualities which the chairman of the Republican policy committee mentioned in the initial speech: Party unity, party philosophy based on principle, party democracy, and party foresight toward the needs of future generations.

With these qualities, the Republicans uniquely are equipped to see the Sino-Soviet challenge as a whole and not in parts. Uniquely are the Republicans qualified to marshal all the forces and resources of our Nation and turn the age ahead from peril to promise.

THE NUMBERS RACKET IN NEW YORK CITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ULLMAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, last week I exposed before this Congress and the Nation the numbers racket of New York City as pauperizing the poor and criminalizing the dwellers of the ghettos. The number of criminals is increasing rapidly according to the records of the courts. The amount of money now being played per year on numbers only, in New York City alone, is $150 million. This figure is arrived at on the basis of estimates made by members of the press in New York.

All of this is operating without a single banker or big controller being arrested. It is entirely in the hands, according to the police department's own admission and statistics, of the maffia syndicate and the combine, as the New York Times reported a week ago, in their Sunday edition, with every single Negro even in the Harlem community, driven out.

Last week I put before this Congress and this Nation the names and addresses of a few of those operating in my district, plus excerpts from my sermon calling on the people of my community to kick the habit of gambling. Police headquarters in New York City issued a bulletin after my speech of last Wednesday saying that the names that I gave them were "no new names" and that the list which I presented here in Congress, photostatic copies of which I hold in my hand, was 5 years old. These are the photostatic copies of the lists found on former Police Sergeant Luberda when he was arrested in March of last year by State troopers near Suffern, N.Y., for drunken driving.

Subsequently they found nineteen-thousand-four-hundred-odd dollars in his car. These lists have the names and addresses of a number of places and of

the numbers operators, with the amounts by each name of how much was paid off to the police.

Sergeant Luberda went to prison for 2 years for refusing to testify before the grand jury.

These lists, by the way, were identified in court by a member of District Attorney Frank Hogan's staff as "the pay off list" to the police department. Judge John Mullen in sentencing Luberda to 2 years in prison said, "You are the bag man for the police department."

The police department last Wednesday after my talk here said these lists were 5 years old, and also said I gave no new names. In the first place, there were new names, four, to be exact, and I will repeat them:

Nick Angelo and Louie B., bankers, 3543 Broadway.

Tony D'Amato, 509, 522, and 526 West 147th Street.

Tony Plait, at 529 and 531 West 151st Street.

These are new names.

The police department confessed later that one of them had been arrested, but he was "only a runner." This is an untruth. These four are all big, and the biggest is Tony Plait, at the two addresses I gave to the Congress last week.

Today in my remarks I will list more new names and more numbers headquarters, but in the meantime I am asking the police department to explain to the public why they have not arrested all of those who were named last week if for no other charge than the usual charge, that of vagrancy.

Let us take the word of police headquarters that the list I introduced last week was 5 years old. Mark you, these are the exact words of Deputy Police Commissioner Walter Arm as reported in the daily press in New York, that those lists are 5 years old.

Those lists I gave last week were part of the lists found on the person of former Sergeant Luberda in March of 1959. If these lists are 5 years old, then that means that Luberda, who was on the police force then, was the bag man for the Police Department while on the force. I would like the special committee of Congress which has been investigating payola on TV and radio to look into the $150 million numbers racket in New York and the payola to the police department of New York which, in other words, has been going on for 5 years. We know, of course, it has probably been going on much longer.

The damaging admission by police headquarters that they knew all of these lists for 5 years proves that they knew how much was being paid off by Luberda, because the amount is by each drop, with the weekly payoff, the amount by these names of weekly payoff to the lower echelon, the man on the beat.

I asked them publicly why they did nothing about this for 5 years. The public knows they did nothing.

Since the lists are 5 years old, then that means also the police headquarters knew who the bankers were—these names are here—where they were operating during that 5 years and yet let them operate freely without any arrests.

The very first name there, Louie the Gimp, was not arrested until I held a conference with the police commissioner and complained about Louie the Gimp, one of the biggest, operating a numbers bank in front of my church. Then and only then was he arrested. If they, the police department, say they knew about it for 5 years, since police headquarters knew that the list found on Luberda was 5 years old, why did they obstruct justice by not so informing the district attorney, Frank Hogan? The release from the police department, the list of 5 years ago, is also corroborating evidence, and this is important, that the gambling stamp tax which we passed here in 1951 is now due for at least 5 years on each one of the names mentioned.

I just received a letter a few minutes ago from Mr. H. Allan Long, who is director of the Intelligence Division of the Treasury Department. In response to my remarks of last Wednesday, he writes me, and the letter just came, that they are working on the gambling stamp tax of these named, and I quote from his letter, and it is already in the hands of the New York office.

The next point I want to bring out is—how can the police department and the district attorney's office find out who the overlords are in back of this $150 million racket?

Ninety percent of the bail bond business is handled by one man. How can we find out who pays off this one man? Because the bail bond fee and the forfeiture are not paid for by the man when he is arrested. They are paid for by someone else.

First. The application for the bail bond in New York City shows who pays the premium, and that is in the office of the company. The company is known to me and the company is known to the authorities in New York. So, therefore, it would be easy to find this information.

Second. The confession of judgment on the bail bond shows who pays the forfeiture. This must be signed in advance.

Third. And this is the important part, and this is a most important part, the affidavit filed with the court under the law of New York shows at whose request the bond is written when the bond is written. This affidavit is found in the court clerk's office attached to the bond.

I might point out that most of the time when the bond is written the defendant is in jail.

With all of the foregoing information, if 200 or 300 of these number runners who are repeaters, and mark you who were arrested before the Sergeant Luberda exposé of March 1959, if they are subpenaed and cross-examined, it would definitely show that they did not pay for their bail bond. They did not pay for their lawyer, even though at the beginning some might lie. After that evidence has been secured, then the bail bondsmen can be brought in and confronted with it and a demand made then as to who did pay for the bail bond.

I would like to say the district attorney for New York, Mr. Hogan, has been very cooperative. I have been working very cooperatively with him. I had an extensive conversation with him last Saturday. On Monday, I received a tip which undoubtedly is going to lead to the very top. I immediately called up Mr. Frank Hogan for whom I have the greatest admiration. He was overjoyed to get it and his office, with his own detective force, is working on this now. This, I think, is going to break within the next few days and I cannot say any more about it because it is too important.

These are new names and new addresses that I am going to give:

Candy store, 469 West 148th Street—under Nick Angelo. Also, the J. & P. Market, 3614 Broadway. The E. & J. TV appliance store at 3638 Broadway. Freddie's No. 2 Grocery Store at 3343 Broadway. Under another known hood named "Al," known to the police department, these are operated: The Big Four Coffee Shop, 3301 Broadway; Produce Market, 3491 Broadway; and again under Nick Angelo, the Piedmont Restaurant at 3301 Broadway. Finally, under two new bankers known only as Sol and Tom, the Amsterdam Market at 2016 Amsterdam Avenue.

I will continue to list these names, continue to turn them over to the district attorney, to the Intelligence Division of the Department of the Treasury, and to another authority that I cannot reveal at present that has been working with me—an authority in our area. I have received many threats, but they mean nothing to me. I will be back here, God willing, Wednesday with more of these names until that day comes when the police department of my town starts arresting these known people and starts closing up these known addresses which, in their own words, they have known for 5 years.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

ANTI-SEMITIC ACTS IN GERMANY AND THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with my dear friend and distinguished associate on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], who addressed this body yesterday, in protest against the apparent inactivity of our Government in connection with anti-Semitic acts in Germany and elsewhere throughout the world. This is one time when our country must act with authoritative firmness. Outrageous attacks upon any people because of their religion or of their race are a challenge to all that our United States of America stands for. I am one of the House sponsors of a concurrent resolution that makes crystal clear the position of the Congress of the United States. I hope that there will be no delay in the adoption of this resolution, which the able chairman of the

Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. MORGAN, promptly has scheduled for committee hearing and action.

From Rabbi Eric Friedland of the district that I have the honor to represent I have received a letter in which he states:

I am impressed with your concurrent resolution in connection with the recent wave of desecration of Jewish houses of worship. I dare say that none of us are in a position to speak authoritatively on the reason for the outrages. Whether they represent a planned attack on a very vulnerable target by neo-Nazis, whether this is a subtle communistic strategy to divide and confuse NATO, whether this is another demonstration of periodic international anti-Semitism, whether it is hoodlumism, or whether it is simply highjinks perpetrated by youth in a quest of "kicks" no one knows. Maybe it is a combination of a few of these factors. Maybe all are represented. At any event, it seems to me that the situation calls for vigorous action. First of all, an effort should be made to ascertain the source of the propaganda and the hostile acts. Secondly, some effort must be made to apprehend the dastardly perpetrators of these monstrous and inhuman acts. Finally, those in positions of authority and those who represent the conscience of the Western World must be heard.

To single out the Jew for humiliation and attack may seem innocent on the surface, but the Jew is a barometer of the moral state of the world. If the world is silent about the Jew, ultimately those who assail the world's morality will destroy all decent people and their institutions as well.

I am pleased that you saw fit to be among the first to take a bold position.

Mr. Speaker, I also am including in my remarks the statement of Rabbi Hayim Goren Perelmuter, another beloved spiritual leader in the Second District of Illinois, as follows:

The Swastika rides again around the world, like *some satanic* satellite of somber warning. There are differences of opinion as to what it betokens.

Some would dismiss it as an outbreak of hoodlum rash, the new search for kicks on the part of delinquent degenerates. Some think it has a neo-Nazi origin. Some say it might emanate from the Communists; and some that an Arab League anti-Jewish factor is involved.

Perhaps there is an element of fact in all of these. But whatever it be, it betokens a serious danger sign as to the health of the body politic of the Western World. The sickness is compounded of a dangerous drift toward appeasement, and a flabby weakness fashioned out of an excess of prosperity.

And as always, the forces that would undermine democracy and decency strike, in whatever slimy manner, at the Jew.

To all of us this should sound an alert and a reaction. A reaction, not of panic, but of positive and courageous posture. If our synagogues are targets for these forces let us hallow them and sanctify them. Let us hallow them and sanctify them by strengthening them with our devoted participation.

We must educate our children better, deepen our own reservoirs of faith, and make the altar of our worship alive with our constant devotion.

We must throw ourselves with renewed vigor into every phase of Jewish activity at home and abroad. And we must alert all forces in the democratic world that they may know for whom this warning bell tolls.

It tolls for all, for Christian as well as Jew, for black as well as white. It tolls for all that is decent in humanity.

A BILL TO AMEND TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce at this time and send to the desk a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to relax the severity of existing provisions with respect to deductions from benefits on account of earnings. I request that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point:

TO AMEND TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT SO AS TO RELAX THE SEVERITY OF EXISTING PROVISIONS WITH RESPECT TO DEDUCTIONS FROM BENEFITS ON ACCOUNT OF EARNINGS

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (2) of section 203(e) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "$80" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$254".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective, in the case of any individual, with respect to taxable years of such individual ending after the month in which this Act is enacted.

This is an identical companion bill to that which Senator KEATING is today introducing in the other House. It is on a subject about which both Senator KEATING and I feel strongly, the welfare of our elderly citizens. The legislation would end the present injustice of the law whereby older people may actually have to pay for the privilege if they wish to work.

At present, as is common knowledge, a person receiving social security benefits can end up with less income by working than if he or she stayed home and lived on social security. If a person earns more than $1,200 per year he loses an entire month's benefits for every $80 or fraction thereof of additional earnings. Since social security payments may run up to $254 per month, a person earning $2,160 per year in wages might lose $3,048 in social security benefits. Such an older person would be in effect paying $888 per year for the privilege of working.

This is morally wrong and psychologically demoralizing for senior citizens who might wish to continue working after they have reached retirement age. Work is an essential ingredient for the happiness, self-respect, and dignity of many elder citizens. In a recent Gallup survey it was found that the overwhelming majority of Americans favor removing the social security earnings limit entirely. Such legislation, notably a bill by Senator KEATING—S. 1168—is at present before the Congress.

However, in default of the broader legislation, the bill I introduce today contains a proposal worked out by Mr. Dwight S. Sargent, an authority in this field, which, while it does not completely remove the earnings limitation, does provide both flexibility and incentive. The bill would raise the allowable monthly earnings increment in excess of $100 from $80 to $254. This latter amount is the maximum family monthly social security payment permitted at the present time. By making this maximum monthly benefit the same as the allowable monthly chargeback figure, we establish the principle that for each dollar earned over $1,200 per year a person drawing social security benefits cannot lose more than he would if he did not work.

Under the Keating-Barry bills the social security earnings limitation would no longer discourage an individual from continuing to work beyond retirement age. I cannot too strongly urge that the bill be given real consideration by the Ways and Means Committee.

I would conclude by inserting in the RECORD at this point a statistical explanation of the social security earnings limit proposal being introduced today by Senator KEATING and myself:

Explanation of social security earnings limit proposal

	Annual income, man age 65, wife and children receiving maximum benefit [1]	
	Present	Proposed
Social security payments (12×$254=$3,048)	$3,048	$3,048
Can earn without penalty	1,200	1,200
Total possible income (including $1,200 in salary)	4,248	4,248
If he earns $1,454 a year; that is, $1,200 plus the equivalent of 1 social security check ($254):		
Social security eligibility	[2] 2,032	[3] 2,794
Earnings from employment	1,454	1,454
Total income	3,486	4,248
Decrease in total income resulting from additional work	[4] 762	0

[1] Maximum benefit is $254 per month.
[2] 4 monthly benefits lost (4×$80, or a fraction thereof, in additional income).
[3] 1 monthly benefit lost under proposed bill.
[4] Represents 3 payments net loss (3×$254=$762). 1 lost benefit of $254 compensated by the extra $254 in income.

A GREAT PROFESSION MUST ACT RESPONSIBLY

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, 1960, the Honorable J. Lee Rankin, Solicitor General of the United States, delivered an interesting and informative address at a meeting sponsored by the Wichita Bar Association.

There were about 800 lawyers in attendance of which many were court

judges in that area. The title of the address is "A Great Profession Must Act Responsibly."

I believe Members of the House will be interested in reading this statement, which follows:

A GREAT PROFESSION MUST ACT RESPONSIBLY

(Address by J. Lee Rankin)

Certain basic attributes are an essential part of a profession. First, it needs to have learning. Study and knowledge of the field involved are indispensable to a practice of a profession. Second, an organization is required to support proper standards of admission, disciplinary proceedings, and concerted action on behalf of the profession. Third, and this is a primary requirement and of at least equal standing, it has to serve the public interest.

The legal profession has all of these characteristics. It is a learned vocation. In this regard it has a background of culture and idealism which encourages the exercise of the art. It is nurtured by a rich tradition. The long roots of historical continuity helps its members to recognize and support the public interest. Its history is both old and honorable. Some of the most celebrated occasions of man's struggle for freedom are those in which members of the bar have championed the cause of justice at great personal sacrifice. Many of our venerated rights were declared and vigorously defended by lawyers. The teachings of these experiences stimulate the bar to revere and support the cause of justice.

In serving the public the bar probably gives more of its resources than any other group. A recital of those engaged in public life either on the local or national level reveals how the American public has grown to rely upon lawyers for the recruitment of its public servants. The contribution to public service does not end there. It is evidenced by innumerable hours, days, and even years devoted to work for the benefit of the public in bar associations as well as lay groups. Wherever it is sought to improve the administration of justice, the legal fraternity is present and generally eager to assist.

The bar's traditional organization is best developed by a brief glance at its history. Looking back, we note that the profession can be traced to Rome. While there are those who might suggest that lawyers were in evidence in Greece, this would be true only insofar as the Roman orator, who is the prototype of the present-day advocate, took the Greek speech writer as his model. Yet, despite the Greek inspiration, it was Rome that gave us the classic law of the legal order. It furnished an authoritative body of materials for the guidance of judicial action, which was different from ethical customs, religion, and public opinion. Even St. Yves, the patron saint of lawyers, was represented with the Twelve Tables drawn from Roman Law. Furthermore, the civil law is largely a refinement on the inheritance received from Rome.

Moving on to the development of Anglo-Saxon law, it is observed that there was a distinctly different growth. In England, the Inns of Court furnished an organization both to train and discipline lawyers. These Inns helped to furnish a fine professional tradition while they were flowering. As the division between barristers and solicitors grew and separate areas of responsibility were established, the barristers became well organized. The solicitors, on the other hand, had no early organization, and when it became necessary to regulate them, the task was undertaken by Parliament and the judges, who at the same time left the control of the barristers with the Inns of Court.

In this developing process the Inns gradually established an educational program, together with standards of conduct that became a strong disciplinary influence. They formulated the rules for proper relations with the courts. From the maintenance of these contacts, within the setting of the Inns, there flowed a judicial or common law, in contrast to the law of the universities, which were the educational centers for the Roman law.

In this process of evolution there developed three branches of professional legal activity. These divisions are not peculiar to the Anglo-Saxon tradition, as their counterparts under different names are found in the civil law. But in England, the agent for litigation became the attorney and later was called solicitor. The advocate or barrister presented cases to the courts. Last, the counselor or adviser was recognized, and gradually his function was taken over by the solicitor, along with the former responsibility of acting as agent for litigation.

During this unfoldment and assignment of work, the legal profession had developed and kept its characteristic fraternal spirit. The unusual ability lawyers have had to engage in fierce forensic arguments and then lay aside all antagonisms and treat their opponents as brethren was fostered by the Inns. This practice has become both legendary and habitual.

While the barristers had the Inns as their organizations, the solicitors did not remain indefinitely without their own association. In the 17th century the Society of Gentleman Practitioners in the Courts of Law and Equity was formed. This, unlike the Inns, was a voluntary group much like a bar association in the United States. Later the Incorporated Law Society was formed and became an effective institution. Then, there followed the law society which is the solicitors' present organization.

Despite the example of these early associations, this activity necessary to the best health of the legal profession gradually waned and almost disappeared, after its first beginnings, in the United States. Following Independence, there was a decided change in attitude toward all things English, and students stopped going from America to the Inns of Court. The Inns had lost much of their influence even in England and through lack of contract, developments in English law after Blackstone had little effect on the bar in the new country.

Bar associations did not flourish nor did lawyers, at least in reputation, in the period after the Revolutionary War. Learning was not considered necessary in a judge and, therefore, not in lawyers. The clergy were thought to have sufficient erudition in the States for all the professions. The disrepute of lawyers was aggravated by their being engrossed in collecting debts and enforcing property rights after the Revolution.

Organizations of the bar were also handicapped by the leveling spirit inspired by democratic ideas. As a result there was a general disbelief in professions after the Revolution. This was reflected in a trend of deprofessionalizing all callings, which set in and prevailed for many years. Along with this tendency, the geographical conditions had a similar effect by producing a decentralization of the administration of justice and the bar that served it.

In places where the members of the Inns of Court were admitted to practice, there was a further disintegration, because those lawyers felt no loyalty to a local bar and its activities. Wherever there remained any organization of the bar, it was fostered by the control over admission, training, and qualification for the profession and in part by social meetings.

Despite all of these difficulties and the general decadence of bar associations, the time from the Revolution to the Civil War was an interval of the greatest achievement in our legal history. The price for the deterioration of the bar's organizations was paid later. But, in the meantime, over a stretch of 75 years, the English materials were built into a common law for America. This result was the work of great judges, with the help of very gifted lawyers practicing before them. Those eminent lawyers handed down a magnificent tradition but were also a product of its inspiration.

During the period of organizational decadence, the legal profession and its group activities had sunk to such a low place in public esteem that legislation was passed which took the training and admission to the practice out of the hands of the bar. Voluntary selective associations kept up the traditions of the bar as they had come over from England, but gradually became dormant or decayed.

In the last third of the 19th century, a revival of legal associations occurred. The renaissance was materially stimulated by the organization of the American Bar Association in 1878. Thereafter, there grew up strong, active associations in each State and in many an integrated bar in the 1920's. In the redevelopment of the organizational movement, there was a ready acceptance of the obligation to the public. The American Bar Association recognized this responsibility by stating in its constitution:

"In the spirit of a service of furthering the administration of justice through and according to the law."

It is difficult to exaggerate the significance to the bar and Nation of the establishment of a legal organization for the entire country. The representative character of the national association with strong, well organized State and local associations behind it, conscious of the professional character, traditions, and responsibilities, was of major importance. It had an immeasurable effect on the strengthening of the profession and devoted itself to trying to lift the practice of law above the level of an individual business. As the organizations were revived, there resulted a considerable voice of the bar in the admission and discipline procedures along with training for admission. This was a resultant fruit of strong, concerted action by those who had high aspirations for their profession.

As one advances from history to the present day, the question arises as to how the bar now discharges its responsibilities to the public. For a long period, lawyers have labored diligently and at a considerable sacrifice to further the programs of the national and local associations. Magnificent contributions have been made, both in skill and dedication to the work in committees, sections, and the general organizational activities. There are those who have given a substantial part of their professional life to such assignments.

The bar has been benefited and enriched by such exertions and, in the process, the public has gained, both from the instruction of the profession and the improvement in the administration of justice that resulted. Law Day, World Peace Through Law, legal studies, and the Awards of Merit are just a few examples of the manifold programs to serve the public in which the bar has been engaged.

However, in examining the standing of the bar's organizations, it must be acknowledged that such pursuits do not always receive the principal public notice. Often, those efforts are buried in the mass of matters which are dealt with, and the slow, patient drive toward improvement in the administration of justice is lost under the cloud of some sensational claim or charge which does injury to both the bar and the public.

In addition to being noted for remarkable accomplishments, bar associations have also become famous for their attacks upon the Supreme Court. Although any reference to the Court is only a minute part of an association's action, such campaigns catch the headlines. As would be expected, there are those who have learned that such offensives are an easy avenue to publicity. And too often, the criticism gives those involved a notoriety that could be obtained in no other way. Usually such an assault is not supported by careful and thoughtful analysis of the opinions or a comparison with prior decisions. However, they have done substantial damage to the bar's repute.

Lest there be any misunderstanding and regardless of the extent to which such criticisms should be censured, it must be recognized that careful and scholarly examinations of the work of the Court are to be welcomed. They, of course, are a different matter. Such studies are of value, since they should be an important stimulant to reappraisal and self-examination by the Court. They can be a spur to greater skill and accomplishment in the discharge of the Court's work.

The question is, however, whether it is responsible for an association of lawyers not to do all within its power to prevent an assault against an institution as precious and valuable to our country as the Supreme Court. Because of the failure to devise sound methods of control, there is the unfortunate recent spectacle of a gifted president of the American Bar Association spending an important part of his term in trying to make it clear that the association had no intention or purpose of reflecting on the Court.

The price of such an experience in public respect is too large for the bar to look forward with complacency to a repetition. As to particularly important proposals, it is time that procedures were adopted, first, to postpone consideration until there is an ample period for careful study and review of all such proposals, both as to what they are and what they may appear to be; and, second, to require a vote of the entire association before any support is given to them. Such preventive measures should go far either to preclude such offensives from gaining the endorsement of the association or being understood to be an attack when none was intended. The suggested revision should not be limited to onslaughts against the Court, however, but should be applied in all cases where the proposal might injure fundamental institutions such as Congress, the executive, or the courts.

The referendum suggested is not without precedent. A referendum under its rules was taken by the American Bar Association on President Roosevelt's proposals with regard to the Federal courts in February and March 1937. A like poll was taken by the association as to all lawyers in the United States at that time. This the association said it was doing in the belief that the voice and opinion of lawyers "should be ascertained and made known in a thoroughly representative way, upon issues vitally affecting the courts of the United States."

While such a poll of lawyers generally might not be necessary or desirable, it could well be important in some instances. Certainly a referendum of the association's members would be a protection for the preservation of our liberties where insidious and indirect reflections might have as much effect as a direct assault on our cherished institutions.

While it is recognized that such procedures would not prevent one lawyer or a group from speaking out, they would avoid the involvement of the organization, except where it carefully chose to act by a means that would demonstrate its will, and only after full study and reflection. They should help to avoid any claim that the association had not acted responsibly. The practice suggested by providing a greater participation in the decision might prevent the harm that is to be anticipated both to the Court and the bar with present procedures.

There is a related area where the associations fall short of their announced goal of furthering the public interest. In committees, sections, and other special groups, those who take part are usually specialists in the field. Too often, some are there to forward special interests of industries and others engaged in the particular activity involved. Occasionally, there are also lawyers participating to further the objectives of their clients. There is frequently a divergence between such objectives and the public interest. In some instances, there is a direct conflict.

The legal profession can hardly defend with the claim of ignorance. From daily experience lawyers are well aware of the risks involved in ex parte hearings. The courts have surrounded such proceedings with numerous safeguards for the protection of the cause of justice. They display an acute awareness of the dangers in hearing only one side.

Admittedly developments such as those described are difficult to control. It is usual and to be expected that those who engage in the practice of a specialization will gravitate to the section or committee dealing with it. It is anticipated that they will furnish much of the skill and experience required for such special projects. However, if the profession is to act responsibly, it has to demonstrate an awareness of this problem and take steps to guard against accepting proposals that would further the special interests at public expense. At least there should be additional independent screening processes.

Precautions in this area of endeavor commend themselves, especially where recommendations are made covering such a comprehensive area, including legislation, rules and regulations, involving both substantive and procedural law. Such a wide range of proposals suggests how imperative it is that all sides be carefully examined, even if a more adequate independent staff is required for its views and suggestions. It would be difficult to claim that action was faithfully taken in the public interest without some such safeguard unless the decision-making group had both the time and the experience to arrive at an independent judgment as to the technical recommendations.

There is yet another area of the bar's concern that deserves careful reexamination in the exercise of its responsibility to the public—that is the proposals which involve positions on controversial political matters as distinguished from the regular legal issues. Associations should act to avoid taking such stands. They are generally divisive and splinter the membership into opposing camps with all the conflicts that that entails.

All who have worked with lawyers know that their philosophies range the full spectrum from conservative to liberal. Their beliefs are fundamental and are developed over a lifetime. Such views are not to be abandoned because of a resolution by any association. But, the group action which reflects on their concepts is embarrassing and tends to drive the lawyers to acts of disassociation by word or deed.

It seems obvious that a result of that kind, although to be expected, is damaging to common activity, mutual respect and regard. It does not conform to the basic tenets of the profession. Lawyers rejoice in independent thinking and are devoted to the belief that ideas should compete for acceptance in the minds of the thoughtful. If the price of membership in an organization is to be conformity, it is too high even for all the other benefits. Because of their nature and the teachings of their experience, the result with lawyers is certain to be either active opposition, open revolt, or a protest by separation.

In addition to these objections to such positions, there is the further fact that in most cases they need not be taken. There is ample for bar associations to do to improve the administration of justice without becoming engrossed in philosophies of political action. Furthermore, the complexion of a political issue appears to change its face so rapidly that a proud resolution of the moment may become quite a sad affair after the expiration of a short time. The high price to an association in its reputation with the public for responsible action and the injury to mutual respect and understanding between members, remains.

In conclusion, it would seem that the standing of the bar would be materially improved by the suggested safeguards. Public esteem, which is sought and believed to be deserved, demands that the profession deal justly with its brethren and the public interest and that it adequately recognize by its actions that its public positions can do harm as well as good. It requires that support of proposals be given only after the exercise of care commensurate with the risks involved. The public rightfully expects that both conduct and appearances demonstrate that the profession's purpose is to minister to justice and especially to scrupulously avoid any injustice resulting from its deliberations. The bar's response should be that the expectation is valid and will be satisfied in accordance with the high standards of a truly great profession. Such an answer would increase the esteem in which the association is held by the public. The organization would exert greater influence by its example in accordance with the bar's professions and the association's stated purposes. It would help to prove that the legal profession had a right to the claim of a great and learned profession that is determined to discharge fully its responsibilities to the public.

WITH OR WITHOUT PEEPHOLES, LET'S GIVE POSTAL EMPLOYEES PRIVACY IN THE MEN'S ROOM

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that each of us has had occasion to complain to the Post Office Department about something.

On Monday of this week, for instance, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] objected strenuously to the use by postal inspectors of peepholes in post offices. While I cannot agree with everything the gentleman said about this kind of postal inspection, I surely agree that if there has been misuse of peepholes—such as to spy on union meetings—it must be halted.

However, the complaint against the Post Office Department which I wish to set forth today has less to do with peephole inspection tactics, and more to do with this question: Are not postal employees entitled to privacy when using some parts of the men's room in a post office?

Mr. Speaker, since September of 1958 I have been trying to get the Post Office Department to recognize this right of privacy in the Hilltop postal station in Milwaukee. Although it might be said that a victory of sorts was scored, the right of privacy was not really secured, and the case of the doorless water closets is not closed.

The story can best be told by a chronological presentation of key letters in my correspondence file:

SEPTEMBER 24, 1958.

Col. FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR COLONEL JOHN: I write to call your attention to a situation in the new postal station at 12th and McKinley, which for all I know may be duplicated elsewhere. In the men's washroom the three toilets are without any front covering or other privacy device. The toilet room opens directly on the room used by postal employees for lunch, smoking, etc.

I can't imagine that this invasion of what seems an elementary right of privacy is necessary for the purposes of postal inspection against defalcation, particularly since many other areas in the building, such as the women's washroom and various closets, are not accessible to the inspector. Furthermore, I understand that there are many other postal installations without such lack of privacy.

I would be very hopeful that the matter can be cleared up, and proper doors installed locally, but if someone in Washington is responsible for this indignity, I will be obliged if you will tell me the man responsible. I shall appreciate your cooperation in this.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

OCTOBER 1, 1958.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: With reference to your letter of September 24, 1958, regarding toilet facilities at Hilltop station. The toilet room door opens directly from the swing room, however, there is a solid screen inside the toilet which eliminates any view of the toilet room and occupants from any person in the swing room.

The buildings leased for postal purposes are secured by the office of the regional real-estate manager. The details are, we believe, worked out by that office on standard specifications from the Post Office Department. We have no local control over contracts for, or construction detail of building for post office purposes. We are consulted as to location, space needed, etc. The matter of toilet stalls is probably one of nationwide policy and would not be changed at this level.

Your letter is being forwarded to the regional operations director, Minneapolis, Minn., for consideration.

Yours truly,

FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster.

OCTOBER 7, 1958.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Reference is made to your letter dated September 24, 1958, addressed to the Postmaster, Milwaukee, Wis., wherein you raise a question as to the toilet enclosures not having doors at Hilltop station, Milwaukee, Wis.

The Post Office Department specifications require that open toilet enclosures be furnished for men and for that reason the existing facilities in Hilltop station are provided.

The purpose of this specification is to permit depredation inspectors to observe the activities of suspects in the case of pilfering of mail.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. KNUDSON,
Regional Operations Director.

OCTOBER 24, 1958.

Col. FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster, Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR COLONEL JOHN: This is in reply to your letter of October 1, 1958, to mine of September 24, in which you say, with reference to the toilet facilities at Hilltop Station, that "there is a solid screen inside the toilet which eliminates any view of the toilet room and occupants from any person in the swing room." I have been up to inspect the Hilltop station twice within the last few weeks. Of the three water closets, two are in full view, whenever the door is open, of people in the swing room; only the third and easterly water closet is protected by the screen in front of the door. I really think that the numerous Federal employees who must lunch in the room deserve something better. For a few dollars, a screen could be erected a few inches north of the water heater. This solution would not in any way interfere with the operation of inspectors. There are probably other perfectly good solutions, though this one would cost only a few dollars.

I'll much appreciate your cooperation.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

OCTOBER 29, 1958.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: Your letter of October 24, 1958, regarding the swing room toilet facilities has been referred to the regional operations director, 512 Nicollet Avenue, Minneapolis 2, Minn., for necessary attention.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
January 16, 1959.

Hon. HENRY REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Some time ago I approached you regarding the toilet facilities at the new Hilltop station post office. I was assured by you at that time that something would be done about it.

You made several visits to the new station and concurred that I had a just complaint.

To this date the situation remains the same, and the carriers at the station are asking when this condition is to be corrected.

As we all realize you were a very busy man during the campaign and the Post Office officials were also busy with the Christmas rush. I have not pursued the matter. Now that the rush is over, I hope something can be done about this situation.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER C. OHM.

JANUARY 19, 1959.

Mr. C. E. KNUDSON,
Regional Operations Director,
Post Office Department,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. KNUDSON: On October 24, 1958, I wrote Col. Frederick C. T. John, Milwaukee postmaster, concerning the inadequate toilet facilities at the Hilltop postal station in Milwaukee. I addressed a copy of this letter to you, and Mr. John by his October 29 letter indicated that my letter had "been referred to the regional operations director, 512 Nicollet Avenue, Minneapolis 2, Minn., for necessary attention."

Since more than 2 months have elapsed, and since the corrective measure I have suggested is such a simple one, I should appreciate a reply to my letter.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

JANUARY 21, 1959.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Referring to your letter of October 24, 1958, addressed to Col. Frederick C. T. John, concerning the toilet facilities at Hilltop postal station in Milwaukee:

Inasmuch as your letter was addressed to Colonel John, this office did not reply, but returned the letter to Colonel John for his reply to you.

After talking with Real Estate Officer Knapp, who supervised the building of Hilltop station and who is thoroughly familiar with it, a recommendation, as per attached letter, was sent to Colonel John, as a means of eliminating the view of any toilets which might be seen from the swing room if by chance the door is left open.

In your letter of October 24, 1958, you suggested a screen could be erected a few inches north of the water heater. The assistant postmaster and superintendent of mails in Milwaukee advise that this is not feasible as it would cause undue congestion in the morning just prior to the time the carriers are due to leave the office and, further, it would block the entry to the location of the washbowls.

Additional study is being given this matter, and if a further solution can be reached you will be so advised.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. KNUDSON,
Regional Operations Director.

NOVEMBER 5, 1958.

POSTMASTER,
Milwaukee, Wis.:

Reference your letter of October 29, 1958, with enclosed letter from Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, concerning the need for a screen to provide privacy for the toilet facilities in the above postal station.

In view of the information you have furnished concerning the size and arrangement of the washroom in question, and after consultation with Real Estate Officer Knapp who is familiar with that building, it is suggested that lockers in the swing room outside of the washroom could be arranged in such a way as to form a screen in front of the washroom door. This would not take up any additional space in the swing room as the lockers have to be located there in any event.

I am returning the original copy of the Congressman's letter addressed to you.

JOHN K. STORR.

JANUARY 26, 1959.

Col. FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR COLONEL JOHN: I have now heard from Mr. Knudson of the Minneapolis regional office concerning the toilet facilities at the Hilltop postal station in Milwaukee. Mr. Knudson pointed out the recommendation made on November 5, 1958, after consultation with Real Estate Officer Knapp.

I am anxious that something satisfactory be done, whether in accord with the Knapp recommendation or otherwise. May I hear from you on this, please?

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 12, 1959.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: With reference to your letter of January 26, 1959, regarding the toilet facilities at Hilltop station. I have again gone over the situation at that point. Mr. F. E. Knapp, regional real estate officer, advised that a row of lockers could

be placed in front of the door. He apparently overlooked the fact that the swing room is only 12 feet 6 inches by 18 feet 6 inches and has barely enough room to care for the two tables and necessary chairs and food vending equipment. No lockers have been placed in the swing room and it is not possible to place any at that point without discontinuing use of the swing room for eating purposes.

We are in a quandary as to just what can be done with the present physical arrangement of the building. We can, of course, remove the tables, employees' vending machines, etc., from the swing room and place this equipment in the northwest corner of the workroom floor. As many lockers as will fit into the swing room can be removed from the workroom floor to accomplish this.

We are loath to take this action however, as a somewhat unsanitary and at times unsightly condition could possibly be viewed by the public using the lobby. There is always, of course, the possibility that some of the employees' sensibilities will be offended even more by moving the swing room to the workroom floor than under the present arrangement.

We are reluctant to make any changes, particularly as the clerical as well as the carrier force are affected. We have had no complaints made to us by the clerical personnel regarding the present arrangement. The expense to the Department of any physical change in a new building does not appear warranted in this instance.

Yours very truly,

FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster.
By M. G. EBERLEIN,
Assistant Postmaster.

FEBRUARY 16, 1959.

Mr. WALTER C. OHM,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. OHM: I enclose herewith a copy of the letter of Regional Operations Director Knudson of January 21, 1959, and a copy of Mr. Eberlein's letter of February 12.

Needless to say, I am most unsatisfied with the present position. I would like to be in a position of recommending something definite, and feel that first it should be a recommendation that meets with the approval of the carrier force and clerical personnel at the Hilltop station.

Would you give this some thought, discuss it with various others, and then be good enough to make some sort of recommendation to me, that I may follow through on it?

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *February 24, 1959.*

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your letter of February 18 suggesting I consult with the carrier and clerical force in finding some solution as to what can be done about the toilet facilities at Hilltop station.

After careful discussion with the personnel we have come to the conclusion that the only remedy is doors.

If the toilets had been installed on the east or west walls, no doors would be necessary, but since the toilets are the first thing that faces you as you enter it is only fair and just that doors be installed. To install these doors would cost about $5 if plywood were used.

As all personnel do wash their hands before leaving the office I am sure you can understand what an awful sight it is to see three toilets in use staring you in the face in entering that washroom.

If the doors should take away the view from the walk above, I am sure that could be remedied by the lowering of the partitions between the toilets.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER C. OHM.

FEBRUARY 26, 1959.

Col. FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster, Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR COLONEL JOHN: This is in reply to your letter of February 12, 1959, through Mr. Eberlein, regarding the toilet facilities at Hilltop station.

From my discussions with both the carrier and clerical personnel at Hilltop station, I believe a reasonable and inexpensive remedy for the ignoble situation in the Hilltop swing room and washroom would be to install plywood doors in front of the three toilets. If these plywood doors should in any way obstruct the inspector's view from the walk above, that could be remedied by lowering the partitions between the toilets.

I am sure that these doors would not cost more than around $5 apiece, but if there is any difficulty about paying for them, I should be delighted to do so myself.

May I hear from you on this?

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 16, 1959.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: With reference to your letter of February 26, 1958, regarding the toilet facilities at Hilltop station. A personal visit was made to the office by the regional space requirements officer, regional real estate officer, the assistant postmaster, and general superintendent of mails. It was the considered opinion of the group that the complaint was hardly justifiable because of the fact that it is almost impossible to look into the toilet room from the swing room.

I believe the regional operations director has previously explained to you the reason that doors are not placed on the toilet room stalls in post office buildings.

Yours very truly,

FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster.
By M. G. EBERLEIN,
Assistant Postmaster.

MARCH 24, 1959.

Hon. ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: I regret that it has become necessary to write to you about such a matter as the toilet facilities at the Hilltop postal station in Milwaukee, Wis. However, since September 24, 1958, I have conducted a lengthy correspondence on this matter with the postal authorities in Milwaukee and the Minneapolis regional office of the Post Office Department. So far my efforts have resulted in nothing more than a fat file of no-action letters.

Let me say that I am fully aware of the need for postal inspectors to be able to see into toilet enclosures to observe the activities of suspects in the case of pilfering of mail.

However, I am sure you will agree that postal employees are entitled to reasonable privacy when using toilet facilities. You will agree, too, I believe, that other postal employees who are not using the toilet facilities should not have to look at those who are.

I have visited the Hilltop station in Milwaukee—a new station, by the way—and can assure you that there is no privacy in the men's toilet enclosures there. There are no doors on the three enclosures. Perhaps this would not be so bad, except that the men's toilet room opens directly on the so-called swing room where the postal employees eat their lunch, smoke, etc. The lunch eaters can hardly help but see the toilet users. This is a situation not calculated to improve digestion.

In my correspondence with the Milwaukee and Minneapolis postal authorities, mention has been made of a number of suggested remedies, but all have been discarded, on grounds of impracticability, expense, or what have you. Finally, in my letter of February 26, 1959, to Postmaster Frederick C. T. John, I offered to pay the cost of installing plywood doors on the three toilets. I quote from my letter to Postmaster John:

"From my discussions with both the carrier and clerical personnel at Hilltop station, I believe a reasonable and inexpensive remedy for the ignoble situation in the Hilltop swing room and washroom would be to install plywood doors in front of the three toilets. If these plywood doors should in any way obstruct the inspector's view from the walk above, that could be remedied by lowering the partitions between the toilets. I am sure that these doors would not cost more than around $5 apiece, but if there is any difficulty about paying for them, I should be delighted to do so myself."

The postmaster's reply of March 16, 1959, was another rejection of any suggestion for solving the situation.

I insist that there must be a satisfactory way to respect the privacy of postal employees without depriving postal inspectors of an adequate view of toilet enclosures. Something can, and in fact must be done about this situation. I urge you to see that something is done, promptly. May I hear from you?

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 26, 1959.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your letter of March 24 concerning proper toilet facilities at the Hilltop postal station in Milwaukee, Wis.

I am requesting the Bureau of Facilities to look into this situation and write you direct as promptly as possible.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General.

APRIL 15, 1959.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: The Postmaster General has requested this office to reply further to your recent letter concerning proper toilet facilities at the Hilltop station in Milwaukee, Wis.

Arrangements will be made to install an L-shaped partition to provide privacy when using toilet facilities.

Thank you very much for your interest.

For Assistant Postmaster General Barnard.

Cordially,

JACK E. GRANT,
Special Assistant to the
Assistant Postmaster General.

APRIL 29, 1959.

Mr. WALTER C. OHM,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. OHM: I am delighted to report that my last letter to the Postmaster General concerning proper toilet facilities at the Hilltop Station in Milwaukee is producing results.

I quote the following from a letter I have received from Jack E. Grant, special assistant to Assistant Postmaster General Barnard (Bureau of Facilities):

"Arrangements will be made to install an 'L' shaped partition to provide privacy when using toilet facilities."

I trust that this improvement will be made soon, and that it will be satisfactory to all concerned. Please let me know if this is not the case.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *May 4, 1959.*

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am sure happy to hear that progress is being made to rectify the toilet facilities at Hilltop station post office.

I also wish to thank you for all your efforts. Without your help I am sure the cause would have been a loss.

The last action took place about a month ago when a representative of the Minneapolis regional office came down and took some pictures, but I am sure that something is being planned.

I shall inform you of the progress as soon as they start.

Again, my heartfelt thanks.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER C. OHM.

MAY 5, 1959.

Mr. WALTER C. OHM,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. OHM: Thanks for your letter of May 4. It was a long fight, but we seem to have won.

Please do let me know when they install the partition they spoke of. I think we ought to have a celebration when it happens. And if there is more delay in installing it, I'd like to know that, too.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *June 11, 1959.*

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have been holding off writing to you in the hope that the toilet facilities at the Hilltop station would be corrected in a short time. It has now been a month since some worker came down and took measurements, but since that time nothing has been done.

May I again call on the assistance of your office in getting this job done. I am sure that a letter from your office would clear up this bottleneck which has been in our way for nearly a year and get the wheels of health and dignity going again at the Hilltop station.

After all the publicity in the papers I must answer the question I hear every day, "When is this situation going to be corrected?"

Hoping that your letter may again get us action, I remain,

Sincerely,

WALTER C. OHM.

June 12, 1959: Telephone call to Post Office Department by Reuss office protesting failure to install partition. Return call from Jack E. Grant, special assistant to the Assistant Postmaster General, stating that the partition was about to be installed. Several days later, another call from Grant stating the partition had been installed.

JULY 7, 1959.

Mr. WALTER C. OHM,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. OHM: Some days ago I was advised by Jack Grant, special assistant to Assistant Postmaster General Barnard, that the partition had been installed at the Hilltop station. This was after I had again contacted the Post Office Department, following your last letter to me.

Since I have received assurances before from the Post Office Department which were not quite accurate, I am writing you to make sure that the partition has been installed, and to ask whether the solution is satisfactory. I certainly hope that it is, and only regret that it could not have been accomplished in far less time.

Sincerely,

HENRY R. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *July 10, 1959.*

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I am in receipt of your letter of inquiry as to what has been done at the Hilltop station post office to rectify the still existing condition of our toilet facilities. I wish to inform you that nothing has been done as of this date.

Some weeks ago there was a man here representing the regional office and he suggested that our superintendent, Mr. Pautsch, consult with the personnel. Mr. Pautsch approached me and I suggested a partition be installed, and I also made a diagram of the kind of partition the boys would like installed, all to no avail as of this date.

Mr. Congressman, I realize your time is very valuable and the boys at the Hilltop station have a letter of thanks and appreciation ready to mail out as soon as they start on this great(?) small project.

Thanks again for your great interest in the welfare of the letter carrier.

Sincerely,

WALTER C. OHM.

July 16, 1959: Mr. Grant of Post Office Department stated in a telephone conversation that the Hilltop station partition would be in today without fail.

JULY 16, 1959.

WALTER C. OHM,
Milwaukee, Wis.:

Post Office Department assures me that installation of Hilltop station partition will definitely be completed today. If it is not, please wire me collect. If it is, let us all say a prayer of thanks for eventual victory over bureaucracy.

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
July 18, 1959, 5 p.m.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: As of this day and hour, no partition has been installed at the Hilltop station post office.

The owners of the building were in yesterday, July 16, and again took some measurements, but that was all that was done.

The partition they plan to install is not in the interest and welfare of the employees. The only remedy, as I suggested, is a partition in front of the lavatories or doors on the lavatories. As the toilet bowls were installed in front of the entrance I think the Department should go along and install a partition or doors in front of the toilets. As you know, there are 102 men using the washrooms and when they go in to wash their hands they still must set their eyes on these three toilets in use.

Mr. Congressman, we are still counting on you to see this through to a successful conclusion.

Sorry I could not answer by wire as my explanation would be too lengthy.

Enclosed find drawing of proposed partition.

Sincerely,

WALTER C. OHM.

JULY 20, 1959.

Mr. WALTER C. OHM,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. OHM: I have your letter of 5 p.m., July 18, 1959, reporting that, despite the promises of the Post Office Department to me, nothing has been done at the Hilltop station except the taking of measurements for a partition that won't solve the problem.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I wrote today to the Postmaster General (a copy of which also went to Mr. Grant, the man who has been giving me all of the false assurances of action).

Thanks very much for sending me the diagram. It refreshes my memory of the whole situation and makes more clear than ever that the real solution is doors.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

JULY 20, 1959.

Mr. JACK E. GRANT,
Special Assistant to the Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Facilities, Post Office Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRANT: I enclose a copy of a letter written today to the Postmaster General, concerning the continuing failure to provide privacy for persons using the toilet facilities at Hilltop station, Milwaukee.

I am sending you a copy in the hope that it may help to expedite the matter. I particularly call your attention to the fact that the partition which apparently is scheduled to be installed would not be a satisfactory answer to the problem.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

JULY 20, 1959.

Hon. ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General,
Post Office Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: On March 24, 1959, I wrote to you, as a last resort, in an effort to get action on a matter that had even then been pending for 6 months—namely, the installation of doors or partitions to provide privacy for persons using the toilet facilities at the Hilltop postal station in Milwaukee, Wis.

Under date of April 15, 1959, Mr. Jack E. Grant, Special Assistant to Assistant Postmaster General Barnard, wrote me as follows: "Arrangements will be made to install an 'L' shaped partition to provide privacy when using toilet facilities."

This led me to believe that the situation would be remedied within a reasonable time. Imagine my shock, then, when I was told on June 12, 1959, by Hilltop station employees that nothing had been done. My office quickly contacted Mr. Grant. A day or two later he replied by telephone, stating that he had checked with Milwaukee and been advised that the partition had been installed.

Again I thought our troubles were over, Just to make sure, I wrote one of the Hilltop station employees on July 7, 1959, asking if everything was satisfactory. I could hardly believe it when I heard on July 13, 1959, that still nothing had been done. Again we called Mr. Grant. This time he replied, a couple of days later, that an absolute deadline had

been set for completion of the installation of the partition at Hilltop station. That deadline was July 16, 1959. It was not met.

This morning I received another letter from a Hilltop station employee. What happened on July 16 was that some people came into the Hilltop station and took some measurements. Furthermore, I am advised that the partition for which they measured would not—even if it were ever installed—provide privacy for persons using the toilet facilities.

As I stated in my previous letter to you, I have visited the Hilltop station myself. I have observed this situation at firsthand.

For the life of me, I cannot see why it is not possible to install on each of the three toilet enclosures an inexpensive door that is low enough for the postal inspectors to see over, yet high enough to provide some privacy to persons using the toilets. I point out that the postal inspectors' observation post is elevated, so that they can look down upon the proceedings. Low doors or partitions would not block the inspector's view. But they would make it possible for someone to walk into the men's room to wash his hands without seeing three toilets totally exposed and in use.

If we can't solve this small problem to the satisfaction of all concerned, I really fear that we are all doomed. May I hear from you promptly?

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *July 23, 1959.*

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Once again I must report to you on the toilet facilities at the Hilltop station.

The partition 30 inches wide was installed as per my diagram. When the boys look at that partition they get sick at heart and wonder just what kind of people can install such a monstrosity. I am sure that within a very short time someone will hurt his hand in opening and closing that door. When the washroom door is fully opened there is only 1⅜ inches between the door and the partition.

I hope that when Congress adjourns we may have the pleasure of once again having a visit from you to the new Hilltop station.

Sincerely,

WALTER C. OHM.

JULY 23, 1959.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: The Postmaster General has asked me to reply to your letter of July 20, with further reference to the Hilltop station in Milwaukee, Wis.

The installation of an L-shaped partition between the swingroom and the toilet room in the Hilltop station was completed on July 20. We regret the delay in completion of this partition from the time that Mr. Jack E. Grant in my office advised you that the action would be taken. However, as you know, this is a privately owned building and it was necessary for negotiations to be made with the owner of the property to install the partition and the owner's own arrangements to complete the work.

In your letter to the Postmaster General you have stated that you do not feel this type of partition provided adequate privacy. In this regard may I say that as a general policy in postal facilities throughout the country, completely private enclosures for toilets are not made. All facilities that have several toilets in the men's lavatory are provided with dividing partitions between the toilet locations, but doors are not installed in front of the toilet itself.

Your original correspondence pointed out the fact that men in the swingroom who were relaxing or eating their lunch could easily see into the toilet room and also see the occupants thereof. We certainly agree that this type of situation should be corrected.

The L-shaped partition which has been installed provides a baffle between the swingroom and the toilet room and provides the privacy which is found in similar facilities elsewhere.

Thank you for your continued interest.

Cordially,

ROLLIN D. BARNARD,
Assistant Postmaster General.

JULY 28, 1959.

Mr. ROLLIN D. BARNARD,
Assistant Postmaster General,
Bureau of Facilities,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARNARD: I have your letter of July 23, 1959, concerning the toilets at the Hilltop postal station in Milwaukee, Wis.

I am advised that a partition of sorts (it is not "L" shaped but "I" shaped) has been installed in the swingroom, in front of the door to the men's room. No doubt this partition does block the view into the men's toilet room of those in the swingroom, satisfying in principle one of my complaints about the Hilltop station situation. (I am told, however, that between this partition and the open door of the men's room there is only a clearance of 1⅜ inches. If a Hilltop station employee should hurt his hand opening the door with this slim clearance, I would not be a bit surprised. I suspect someone's measurements were made with a yardstick that was short on one end or the other.)

With reference to your letter, I am pleased that the Post Office Department agrees with me that men in the swingroom relaxing or eating their lunch should not be able to see easily into the toilet room and also see the occupants thereof. Having agreed on this, can we not strive for a meeting of the minds on even more basic men's toilet policy in postal facilities?

The question as I see it is this: Must everyone entering this men's lavatory, just to wash his hands for example, be confronted with a full and wholly unimpaired view of the toilets and the occupants thereof?

You state that "as a general policy in postal facilities throughout the country, completely private enclosures for toilets are not made." There are dividing partitions between toilets, "but doors are not installed in front of the toilet itself."

At no time have I requested completely private enclosures for toilets. I understand, and have agreed, that postal inspection requirements rule out completely private enclosures. I assume that these inspection requirements are the only thing which rule out completely private enclosures. If there are other reasons, I should like to know them.

I hope we can agree that, under normal conditions, persons using toilets are entitled to privacy whether in a post office or anywhere else; and also that other persons using the same room are entitled not to see the occupants of toilet enclosures.

If I assume correctly that the one abnormal condition in a men's lavoratory such as at the Hilltop station is the inspection requirement, the question then becomes: How can we provide some privacy to toilet occupants; and some restriction of the view of other washroom users, without interfering with the postal inspector's view?

I do not think this an impossible question. At the Hilltop station, for instance, it was my own observation that the postal inspector's lookout point is elevated, near the ceiling of the washroom. While a full-size door, its top at a height of perhaps 6 feet above the floor, would no doubt block the inspector's view, it is my distinct impression that a half-size door, its bottom perhaps 15 inches from the floor and its top perhaps 40 inches high, would not hinder inspection, but would provide reasonable privacy. If necessary, the dividing partitions between the toilets could also be lowered. I am sure there would be no objection to this. The problem is really one of establishing some barrier between the toilet enclosures and the other areas of the washroom. Aside from half-doors along the lines I have described, an alternative is a partition inside the washroom, not outside. It could be set a minimum distance in front of the toilet enclosures, allowing entry to them. It, too, could be considerably less than six feet high, yet provide reasonable privacy without preventing inspection.

The Hilltop station in Milwaukee is one place where I am certain that one or the other measure suggested above is workable. I urge your full and prompt consideration of this matter, and ask a reply as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

JULY 30, 1959.

The Honorable HENRY S. REUSS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: On August 10, 1959, between the hours of 7 p.m. and 9 p.m., a dedication ceremony and open house have been planned for the new Hilltop station of the post office, located at 1301 North 12th Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

Because of your great interest in postal affairs, we feel sure that you would want to celebrate with us and the citizens of Milwaukee on this occasion.

You are cordially invited to attend.

Yours very truly,

FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster.

AUGUST 6, 1959.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Thank you for your letter of July, with further reference to Hilltop station of the Milwaukee, Wis., post office.

We regret that the partition which has been installed in the swingroom pursuant to your original request does not meet with your complete approval.

Your further suggestions with regard to installation of doors or other material to provide more privacy have been carefully reviewed. We find, however, that it is not possible to give favorable consideration to these suggestions. As mentioned in previous correspondence, divided partitions between toilets are considered to be adequate privacy. Closures are not installed on the front of the toilet area. We do not find reason to alter this policy in the case of Hilltop station.

Cordially,

ROLLIN D. BARNARD,
Assistant Postmaster General.

AUGUST 10, 1959.

Postmaster FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Care of Hilltop Postal Station,
Milwaukee, Wis.:

Regret congressional business keeps me from joining in dedication of Hilltop station. I heartily approve of the new station, except for lack of privacy in men's washroom, and intend to continue my efforts to correct that situation.

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

AUGUST 10, 1959.

Mr. WALTER C. OHM,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. OHM: This is with further reference to the men's washroom situation at the Hilltop postal station.

First, I enclose a copy of a telegram I sent to Postmaster John today for the dedication. I am much interested in knowing if Mr. John read the telegram at the ceremonies.

Second, enclosed is the latest letter from Assistant Postmaster General Barnard, which appears to be a total rejection of any suggestions for providing even a minimum of privacy in the men's washroom.

I continue to feel that the Post Office Department is being unnecessarily rigid in this matter. I intend to compile a full record of this case, and place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the full story will be told. Whether this will produce better results I do not know, but I hope so. If you have any other suggestions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *August 13, 1959.*

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: With reference to your letter of August 10, our dedication ceremony at the Hilltop station was quite a success, but the full content of your telegram was not read, only the congratulations and your regrets at not being able to be there. It was read by Supervisor Doyne (master of ceremonies). The speakers were two county supervisors, the postmaster, president of the Vliet Street Advancement Association, and a member of the Minneapolis regional office. Some of the boys took the supervisors around and showed them the conditions we have to contend with in using the washroom facilities. The officials here say it is out of their hands, to "see the regional men."

Mr. Congressman, in my 35 years as a letter carrier, I have always found the Post Office Department very eager to carry out the wishes of a Congressman. I think there is some single person who is at fault and I hope you will be able to single out that man and never forget him.

I think our request is a fair and just one. After all, this is not the Army at war. In private industry they certainly would not tolerate any man who plans toilet facilities as we have at the Hilltop station. It is my genuine opinion that the regional men drew up the plans, and they have no alternative but to put up a partition or doors to hide their mistake and give the men back their dignity and self-respect. It may be a good idea to invite some high post office official down here to see for himself.

Thanks again for your time and effort to correct this situation.

Sincerely,

WALTER C. OHM.

Mr. Speaker, there rests the battle of the Hilltop station men's room. If other Members of Congress have suggestions as to where we go from here, I would be delighted to receive them.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LINDSAY, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday and Thursday of next week, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter, vacating his special orders for today and tomorrow.

Mr. JOHANSEN (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM), on January 25, 1960, for 1 hour.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM), on February 10, for 1 hour.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM), on January 21, for 10 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 1 hour, on January 27, 1960.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. O'NEILL (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts) and include extraneous matter.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM) were granted permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter:

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. BREWSTER and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mr. SHELLEY.

Mr. SANTANGELO in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 21, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1707. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting the 38th Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958, pursuant to section 16 of the Civil Service Retirement Act (H. Doc. No. 316); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

1708. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the quarterly report of Federal contributions for the quarter ending December 31, 1959, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1709. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report on the status of training of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and the progress made in strengthening of the Reserve components during fiscal year 1959, pursuant to section 279 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1710. A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, relative to the disposal of foreign excess property during fiscal year 1959, pursuant to section 404, 63 Stat. 398; 40 U.S.C. 514; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1711. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the financial assistance activities in five field offices of the Small Business Administration (SBA) made during the latter months of calendar year 1958; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1712. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of the final valuations of properties of certain carriers, pursuant to section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1713. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the 14th annual report describing the operations of the Federal Aviation Agency under the Federal Airport Act, as amended, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1714. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 under provisions of law other than section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1715. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, transmitting the 43d Annual Report of the U.S. Tariff Commission, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1716. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report relating to the payment of claims for damage occasioned by vessels of the Coast Guard, which have been settled by the Treasury, pursuant to section 646(b) of title 14, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1717. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing the payment of a claim to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. of Baltimore, Md., pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 646(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1718. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 340. Resolution providing two additional assistants for the document room, Office of the Doorkeeper; without amendment (Rept. No. 1209). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 410. Resolution to amend House Resolution 136, 86th Congress, as amended by House Resolution 181, 86th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1210). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 413. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain

funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; with amendment (Rept. No. 1211). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 9761. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9762. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce to 30 the age at which an individual may become eligible for disability insurance benefits, and to provide that such benefits will be paid at a reduced rate to any individual who has not attained the present minimum age of 50; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 9763. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to relax the severity of existing provisions with respect to deductions from benefits on account of earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 9764. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to negotiate a new contract with the city of Sturgis, S. Dak., with respect to the use of the sewage facilities of such city by the Fort Meade Veterans' Hospital, Sturgis, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H.R. 9765. A bill to provide for liberalized benefits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act for certain emergency workers and their survivors; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 9766. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 9767. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H.R. 9768. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the period within which veterans may pursue programs of education and training based upon Korean conflict service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 9769. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9770. A bill to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the uniformed services retired before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9771. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 9772. A bill to provide that withdrawals and reservations of public lands for nondefense uses shall take effect only upon certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 9773. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any Department or Agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 9774. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase benefit amounts, liberalize the work clause, provide disability insurance benefits without regard to age, and improve the earnings of the social security trust funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9775. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of Federal funds payable thereunder to States which have approved plans for old-age assistance and which maintain their expenditures for such assistance at or above the 1959 level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9776. A bill for the relief of the city of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 9777. A bill to require air carriers to inspect for destructive substances all articles taken aboard certain aircraft operated by them in air transportation; to permit persons injured by failure of an air carrier to so inspect to bring an action for damages against the air carrier; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9778. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require air carriers to maintain route maps in conjunction with certain weather information for the benefit of their passengers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 9779. A bill authorizing the construction of certain improvements in the interest of flood control and allied purposes on the Gila and Salt Rivers, Ariz., from Gillespie Dam to Granite Reef Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 9780. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm cost; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 9781. A bill to repeal the laws imposing Federal control on agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9782. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to establish a new program of mortgage insurance designed to assist the financing of residential housing located in older urban neighborhoods; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 9783. A bill to determine the need for a canal across Santa Rosa Island, Fla., in the vicinity of Navarre to connect Santa Rosa Sound with the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 9784. A bill to amend sections 706 and 744 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9785. A bill to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9786. A bill to amend sections 511 and 512 of title 38, United States Code, to permit Indian war and Spanish-American War veterans to elect to receive pension at the rates applicable to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9787. A bill to amend section 314 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that an aid and attendance allowance of $150 per month shall be paid to certain paraplegic veterans during periods in which they are not hospitalized at Government expense; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9788. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the furnishing of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to any child on account of the death of more than one parent in the same parental line; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9789. A bill to amend chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that a double indemnity feature may be included in policies of national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 9790. A bill to extend to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Rebellion, eligibility for hospital care at Veterans' Administration facilities for any disability to the same extent as outpatient medical services are now furnished them; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9791. A bill to amend section 4108 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that persons rated as specialists in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration shall not receive the 15-percent special allowance unless the specialty in which rated is usable in Veterans' Administration facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9792. A bill to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 9793. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to broaden the definition of "disability" for individuals 60 years of age or over, to eliminate the requirement that an individual must attain age 50 to qualify for disability insurance benefits, and to provide that disabled individuals may become entitled to widows' or widowers' insurance benefits without regard to age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.J. Res. 564. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday of September as Senior Citizens Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 565. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 463. Concurrent resolution favoring a general conference to review the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 425. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Res. 426. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to the need for rapid and complete atomic disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 427. Resolution to provide for the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 101; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H.R. 9794. A bill for the relief of Chien-Min Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9795. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nellie Tilford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 9796. A bill for the relief of the National Aircraft Maintenance Corp. and Howard E. Cox and the estate of Archibald Watson, deceased, sole stockholders of the National Aircraft Maintenance Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9797. A bill for the relief of Tom Fook Tin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9798. A bill for the relief of Joanin P. Demas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 9799. A bill for the relief of Cynthia A. Patton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 9800. A bill providing for the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Dr. Thomas Dooley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

315. By Mr. STRATTON: Petition of a group of employees of the Schenectady plant of General Electric urging the adoption of legislation providing for lowering of the age that a person may voluntarily retire and draw a full social security pension to 60 and exempting such pension from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

316. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the State central committeeman, Young Democrats, Long Beach, Calif., supporting S. 1138, the peacetime GI bill; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Application of State Antidiscrimination Law—The Issue of Federal-State Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on several occasions in the 1st session of the 86th Congress I expressed concern that the Department of State was represented as having advised the New York State Commission Against Discrimination that a ruling by the commission applying the fair employment law of New York to the hiring policies of the Arabian American Oil Co. in New York State would adversely affect U.S. interests abroad. My concern was for the maintenance of appropriate Federal-State relationships and for the human rights aspects of the matter. Accordingly, I initiated correspondence with the Department of State. Thereafter, and expressly in the light of this correspondence, a New York judge decided that New York fair employment law should be applied, holding that the Department of State had taken no stand on the case. To complete the story, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three letters not previously published in the RECORD, which are an intrinsic part of the correspondence to which I have referred, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 3, 1959.

The Honorable E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: I have for reply your further letter of June 29 on the subject of the case of the *American Jewish Congress* v. *The Arabian American Oil Company* which has been under consideration before the New York State Commission Against Discrimination.

I appreciate the interest you have shown in discussing the Department's role in this matter during the course of our recent correspondence. As Mr. Josephson of your staff has undoubtedly informed you, he and representatives of the American Jewish Congress also examined the question in some detail in a meeting with Deputy Assistant Secretary Parker T. Hart on June 30.

It is my understanding that the matter will be heard before the Supreme Court of the State of New York on July 6. It is our feeling in the Department that it would not be appropriate for us to comment further on this case when a hearing of it before the New York courts is thus imminent. I am certain from your letter that you appreciate our position in this matter.

I assure you, however, that it is our desire to be appropriately helpful in resolving problems which arise out of actions by foreign governments which appear to discriminate against U.S. citizens. We shall, of course, be prepared to provide any further information on these problems which the commission or the court in New York may seek. I personally would also be prepared and pleased to discuss the Department's role in this case, as well as the general problem, directly with you at any time at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

JULY 20, 1959.

Mr. WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACOMBER: Thank you for your letter of July 3, to which I have withheld my response pending a decision in the New York litigation. Now that the court has held Aramco's questioning of job applicants in the city of New York about their religious beliefs to be a violation of the State law, it would seem that a personal conference between us on this subject would be unnecessary. Perhaps, indeed, the question of the Department's role has been rendered moot.

The opinion by the New York Supreme Court demonstrated the distinction between an order forbidding religious questioning and an order requiring the employment of Jews in Saudi Arabia. This distinction, which I sought to make in my correspondence with you, is essential. An order of the latter type was not sought in the New York litigation. The order of the former type, which was sought and granted, presented no conceivable damage to U.S. interests in the Middle East.

If the Department had not been involved deeply in the New York litigation, by reason of correspondence to the New York commissioner, your statement in your letter of July 3 that comment by the Department on the case "would not be appropriate" would have been unassailable. But because of the Department's involvement, I was seeking disengagement by the Department from the position in which it had been cast. Although I recognized the fact that the Department has never expressed itself on the precise issues involved in the New York litigation, I was aware that the Department had appeared to some to have assumed a policy position in the matter.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. BARTLETT.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 29, 1959.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. BARTLETT: I thank you for your letter of July 20 discussing the findings of the Supreme Court of the State of New York in the case brought by the American Jewish Congress against the Arabian American Oil Co. and the New York State Commission Against Discrimination. The Department has throughout the hearing of this case been appreciative of your comments and concern, particularly since we share your conviction that the proper policy of our Government must be to work for the elimination of any procedures adopted by foreign states which tend to discriminate against our citizens in any way, including discrimination on the basis of race or religion.

As stated in our earlier correspondence, this Department has consistently maintained the position that it would not be proper for it to comment on a case being heard in a State court. We did not do so in this case. Nor did we assume a policy position in the matter, our only connection having been to reply in a general sense, as we consider ourselves properly obliged to do, to a request for information received from the authorities of the State of New York.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

Revision of the Social Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I think all my colleagues will agree with me when I say that one of the major, if not the major, issues facing the 2d session of the 86th Congress is revision of the social security law. Researches and on-the-scene surveys conducted throughout 1959 have demonstrated beyond question that

our elderly citizens have suffered a steady deterioration so far as their income positions are concerned, and that this trend is certain to continue unless this Congress takes remedial steps.

In this connection, I should like to call my colleagues' attention to an anniversary that is being remembered and celebrated this month by millions of elderly citizens throughout the vast reaches of this great land.

Dr. Francis E. Townsend, who pioneered the pension movement in America, and still heads the organization he founded, was 93 years of age on January 13. Still hale and hearty despite his advanced years, the doctor is even at this moment engaged in a vigorous speaking tour on the west coast, urging upon his audiences the acceptance of the plan he fathered.

That plan is before this Congress in the form of my bill, H.R. 4000. It calls for universal retirement benefits to persons age 60 and older, and to certain other groups including the disabled and widows with dependent children.

This program, to be financed from the proceeds of a modest 2 percent tax on gross incomes, would result in monthly benefits of about $140, and would be paid as a matter of right. H.R. 4000, unlike the social security program, calls for genuine pay-as-we-go financing.

The genius of Dr. Townsend lies in the appeal of a dream which captured the imagination of millions of his fellow citizens some 25 years ago and today commands increased respect, not only among the aged people of this country, but now, too, among the students of the social security problem, and among those of us in this Chamber who have been elected to serve the best interests of our constituents.

It is fitting, therefore, that we pay tribute to Dr. Townsend on the occasion of his 93d birthday. It is given to few men to live so long and accomplish so much and earn the devotion of so many fervent followers. May he live to celebrate many another birthday—and to realize at long last the fruits of his efforts on behalf of his fellow Americans.

Senator Symington's Views on U.S. Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, the safety and survival of the United States and its friends and allies in the non-Communist world surely overrides all other issues facing the 2d session of this 86th Congress.

I share the concern of many of our colleagues over the adequacy and wisdom of our present defense policies. We are all concerned over the extent of the lag in missile production and space technology. Certainly we must continue to work for an enforceable disarmament agreement, but in the interim—the United States must remain strong.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, has dedicated much of his time to the study and evaluation of our defense posture. He is one of our country's outstanding experts in this field. Recently, on January 10, 1960, Senator SYMINGTON appeared on the "Meet the Press" program. Much of the program was devoted to exploration of the Senator's views on the state of U.S. preparedness. I am pleased to commend to our colleagues the transcript of that interview by a panel of veteran Washington correspondents.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I submit the transcript of the Sunday, January 10, 1960, "Meet the Press" television program. It is my hope that we will be able to approach this all-important issue without resort to partisan recrimination and with the emphasis on how best to keep America strong and free.

"MEET THE PRESS," SUNDAY, JANUARY 10, 1960

(Moderator, Ned Brooks; guest, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri; panel, Roscoe Drummond, New York Herald-Tribune; May Craig, Portland (Maine) Press Herald; Marquis Childs, St. Louis Post Dispatch; Lawrence E. Spivak, regular panel member.)

The ANNOUNCER. Ladies and gentlemen, we invite you to "Meet the Press," the unrehearsed program which has won every major award in its field.

Our guest today is Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, chairman of the Special Agriculture Investigating Subcommittee which begins hearings early this week.

In just a moment Senator SYMINGTON will Meet the Press.

Now "Meet the Press," produced by Lawrence E. Spivak.

Remember that the questions asked by the members of the panel do not necessarily reflect their point of view. It is their way of getting the story for you.

Now here is the moderator of "Meet the Press," Mr. Ned Brooks.

Mr. BROOKS. Welcome once again to "Meet the Press."

Our guest today is Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri. He is one of the five Democrats most frequently mentioned as possible nominees for President.

In the new session of Congress, Senator SYMINGTON will play an important role. He has earned a reputation as a critic of administration defense policies and he is now proposing a program for reorganizing the Defense Department.

He is the chairman of an investigating committee which on Tuesday will begin a far-reaching examination into the operations of the Government's farm program.

Senator SYMINGTON was appointed as the first Secretary of the Air Force when that position was created in 1947. He was first elected to the Senate in 1952. Senator SYMINGTON recently returned from an extensive trip which included Africa and the Middle East.

And now seated around the press table ready to interview Senator SYMINGTON are Marquis Childs of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, May Craig of the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald, Roscoe Drummond of the New York Herald Tribune, and Lawrence E. Spivak, our regular member of the "Meet the Press" panel.

Now, Senator, if you are ready, we will start the questions with Mr. Spivak.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, I would like to assume what everyone else in the political know takes for granted, and that is that you are being seriously advanced for the Democratic presidential nomination, and I would like to ask you some questions on some of the major issues that face us. First, the question of disarmament. While the rest of the world is talking about and hoping for disarmament, you keep hammering away on the question of armament.

Will you tell us where you stand on the question of disarmament?

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Spivak, in 1955 I introduced a resolution which was passed unanimously by the Senate, and the resolution was one of universal disarmament. Nobody can be more for disarmament than I am. On the other hand, I believe it would be wrong and not in the best interests of my country to disarm unilaterally in the face of growing Communist strength.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, do you think we can make any kind of disarmament agreement with the Soviet Union today that would be safe for the free world?

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, I would hope that we could, and I think that it is important that we continue to try. But on the other hand, I think that we have to do two things: First, work for general disarmament, and secondly, be careful that in our desire to obtain a real disarmament agreement we don't sign one that might leave us in a position where it could be violated without our knowing it.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, specifically on nuclear weapons testing we have carried on negotiations now for over a year and the Russians seem to be getting exactly what they want and that is a test ban without inspection.

How long would you continue these negotiations if they continue in this present vein?

Senator SYMINGTON. For 14 months we haven't been testing and for 14 months the Russians have not been testing. It worries me a great deal because as the months go by our experts say continuously that we cannot tell increased size tests on their part if they want to cheat.

I am willing to leave this matter in the hands of the President who says that he has now abandoned the idea of just agreeing to an indefinite extension.

I would hope that we reach an agreement soon because the American people should realize that the longer it is that we have no agreement and yet do not test, the longer, provided the Russians are cheating, the longer we are giving up and therefore in effect disarming unilaterally.

Mr. SPIVAK. You think, then, if we don't get an agreement soon we ought to go back at least to underground testing?

Senator SYMINGTON. I do think we ought to go back to underground testing, yes; provided in the reasonably distant future we don't get an agreemeent that we consider the right agreement.

Mr. DRUMMOND. To touch on one more aspect of the test ban thing, in your judgment and in your knowledge, is there any method of verification that would be adequate to detecting underground testing?

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Drummond, the amount of blast that could not be detected has increased to my certain knowledge in the minds of the experts, 20 times in the last year. Now we are talking "underground," in addition to which there is a great new field of testing in which there is a growing apprehension that we would not be able to detect and that is the field of space. For example, something that was tested halfway to the moon.

Therefore, again I say that all of us are looking toward peace and believe that the best way to get peace is through some form of agreement in this field and all the fields of armament. On the other hand I do think that based on the record we have to proceed with care.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Speaking of space, former President Truman and Senator MANSFIELD this afternoon said that they thought that the Soviet use of the Pacific for rocket testing was an act of arrogance.

Now I'd like to ask whether you think the Pacific is a proper area for rocket launching and what do you believe is the purpose of the proposed Soviet rocket test?

Senator SYMINGTON. Without getting too much into possibly classified territory, I think it shows that fairly soon, based on the orbit they get in the place that they now plan to test, fairly soon they plan to put a man in space. Where they plan to throw these missiles, now, is about 1,100 miles from Pearl Harbor. They are getting closer in their relationships in the space field to our newest State. They are not, however, nearly as close, perhaps, as they are in some other places in the world where the governments appear to be leaning their way.

Mrs. CRAIG. Senator, the President gave us a rather optimistic picture of our defense in his state of the Union message. Does that agree with your knowledge of our own military position?

Senator SYMINGTON. No, Mrs. Craig. I think the President was misinformed in some of the things he told the American people with respect to our defenses.

Mrs. CRAIG. For instance he spoke of our Atlas situation. How much ready intercontinental missiles do we have, do you know?

Senator SYMINGTON. Yes; I do know, but I don't think I should say so on this program. I do think, however, that his statement as to what our position was was oversanguine.

Mrs. CRAIG. Could you give us some idea then perhaps in relation to what you know the Russians have?

Senator SYMINGTON. It has been acknowledged by this administration a year ago, after we corrected some of the statements that were made by some officials, it was acknowledged, admitted that the plan was to allow the Russians to get a lead of 3 to 1. That is what they said the lead would be. Personally I feel that the plans mean that their lead will be greater than 3 to 1. Inasmuch as we have not deviated from our announced plans by the Secretary of Defense at that time, it should be clear to all Americans that we are further behind than we were a year ago in the defense missile field.

Mrs. CRAIG. The President was rather optimistic about the Polaris nuclear subs. How many of them do we have ready?

Senator SYMINGTON. Again I wouldn't want to give the exact figures but I do agree with you that he was misinformed with respect to the statements he made about that weapon also.

Mrs. CRAIG. Well, if he isn't informed, who misinformed him?

Senator SYMINGTON If I was in his position I would be interested in finding out.

Mrs. CRAIG. Well, Senator, that is an extraordinary statement to say the President the Commander in Chief, is misinformed and doesn't know what he is talking about.

Senator SYMINGTON. I didn't say the latter; you did. I did say that I was sure he had been misinformed in some of the statements that he had made in his talk.

Mrs. CRAIG. Does it not follow if he is misinformed, that he doesn't know what he is talking about?

Senator SYMINGTON. You made that statement, not I.

Mr. BROOKS. Senator, could you cite a specific example of where he was misinformed?

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, Mrs. Craig brought up two. One was in what he said about the missiles and the other was what he said about the Polaris submarines

Mr. CHILDS. Well, just to push that a moment further, Senator, how long can the American public take this screen of security—I know you referred to classified information. Shouldn't the public know if the President is misinformed and isn't it your duty to tell us?

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, Mr. Childs, in our form of government, one in a position like mine—a Senator from Missouri—has to be very careful about releasing classified information.

However, I want to say this: The American people now know from this administration that we are well behind in the missile field, even further behind in the space field, and that our plans are to remain that way and get worse.

Now I am amazed that the President in his statement points out that we are going to have the most prosperous year in our history next year, that we are going to have a $4½ billion surplus and at the same time these plans to let the Russians continue their relative growing strength against ours continue. And I'd like to just also say that I don't argue about the fact that under our form of government they have the right to consider the balancing of the budget more important than national security, but I do think that it is unfortunate that the people are not given the facts as to the nature of their actions to that end and the degree that we are falling behind.

Mr. CHILDS. I would like to ask you about that surplus, too, Senator. I gather you would not use that to reduce the national debt, that $4.2 billion, if such a surplus does materialize, is that right?

Senator SYMINGTON. I don't think there is anything more important in the world today than this country, the last great bastion against communism, keeping equal in strength with the Russians. Physically, economically, technologically, psychologically—of course spiritually where we already have a great advantage. Therefore unless they want to reorganize the Department of Defense, to wring out the waste over there that everybody knows is there, and get a new setup, which I am introducing a bill on as soon as I can get the floor, you might say, and unless they want to correct some of the other places in government where we are not having good administration and get the money that way, I most certainly would take that excess the President talks of, that surplus that he talks of, and put it into increasing our defenses.

Mr. CHILDS. Don't you then lay yourself open to the charge of being a spender and willing to unbalance the budget and contributing to our inflation?

Senator SYMINGTON. I don't think that whether we balance the budget, or many of our other plans, will mean much in this world unless we maintain our guard. Nobody wants peace in the world more than I do. Nobody wants peace more than any citizen with common sense. Your only problem is as we move to the summit next May, for example, with the great psychological, technological and physical accomplishments recently of the Soviet, do you have a better chance to negotiate that just and lasting peace we hope for at the summit for example, if you negotiate from a position of relative weakness or one of relative strength. To me that is the most important avenue to peace that we have in the world today.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, you have said there is a great deal of waste in the Defense Department. Am I to understand, then, that if you were President of the United States you wouldn't spend more for defense, that you really would spend less for defense?

Senator SYMINGTON. I would spend more for defense right now. But on the other hand, I would have a single war plan. I'd try to eliminate the constant bickering and arguing and differences between the services by having a single Chief of Staff. I'd have a single war plan, I'd change the service Secretaries to Under Secretaries under the Secretary of Defense so as to build up the latter's authority and I would have a personnel transfer in grade. In other words, I would run the situation on the basis of good business practice instead of letting it drift the way it is today, in tradition.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, when you speak of waste in the Defense Department, is that just a generalized charge or do you know pretty specifically that there is sizable waste and that something could be done about it?

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, Mr. Spivak, you know that. You could name item after item, that because of the disagreements, has been canceled or held back, started and stopped. Things like the Bomarc, things like the Seamaster, the Navaho—here we are today canceling hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of development and research items because each service is being allowed to try to fight the next war by itself.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, Senator, in fact isn't the whole Defense Department a wasteful Defense Department as long as it keeps this in peace—isn't there constant obsolescence? I mean don't you have to research and maybe waste money in research?

Senator SYMINGTON. That is true, that is true, of course. On the other hand, there is no reason why the organizational setup shouldn't be on a basis where the taxpayer gets the most return for his dollar. And in answer to the way you asked the question in the beginning, I would immediately start spending more, for example, in the space field. The degree that we are behind in thrust is almost incredible and yet last year we cut by tens of millions of dollars the one big thrust program we had, the Saturn. I would spend money quick there and I would accelerate these important programs and I'd modernize SAC.

On the other hand, I also would attempt to streamline that Department so that as soon as possible you are beginning to get true defense for your dollar.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, you have spent a great many years studying defense. Do you have any idea how much you could save and how much you would spend if you were the President?

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, I think you could save—and I am on the record as having said I thought you could save 30 percent of the budget. That was when I was pretty close to the Department. If that was only half right today you would save $100 million a week.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Senator, on this program last Sunday, Senator KENNEDY said that if any Democratic leader was unwilling to submit his candidacy to the test of a representative primary, that that Democratic leader would not deserve well of the next national convention.

I'd like to ask whether you share that view.

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Drummond, some time back when some of my friends in New Hampshire asked me if I would go into that primary, I had to make a decision: namely, would I go into primaries or would I not.

Now I know something about primaries. When I first ran for the Senate I was in a primary for 7 months, I believe, and I was in it 7 days a week. My State doesn't have presidential primaries. Only about a third of the States do have these presidential primaries, and less than 10 percent of the States have presidential primaries that are binding.

Anybody can have their own ideas as to the importance of primaries. I have decided not to go into any primaries, at least at this time. And as to whether they should be abolished or not, I wouldn't want to criticize anything that another State had set up. In my State we don't happen to have it and in two-thirds of the States they don't happen to have primaries.

Mrs. CRAIG. Senator, Cuba is only 90 miles from Florida. Do you think that the present Government of Cuba is under Communist influence, dangerous to us?

Senator SYMINGTON. Mrs. Craig, I have it on good authority that Communist influence in Cuba is growing steadily and I know that those people in our Government who should be worrying about it are very worried indeed. As you say it is 90 miles from the United States and that is getting pretty close. It also has one of the world's greatest naval bases at Guantanamo and of course anything that they are doing there could be supplied by submarines anyway.

Mrs. CRAIG. Yes. I wanted to ask you about that. Do you believe that there are submarines hiding on the Cuban coast now?

Senator SYMINGTON. I have heard that but I haven't heard it from such source that I could answer your question formally.

Mrs. CRAIG. Do you think there are missile bases there?

Senator SYMINGTON. I would rather not comment on that question, frankly.

Mr. CHILDS. Senator, getting back to this matter of politics, I checked up a few figures and found you traveled in the fall 32,000 miles and spoke in 22 States. I wonder if it would be fair to call you an active but unavowed candidate. Could that be?

Senator SYMINGTON. First let me answer this way, if I might. In 1958 I had another decision to make also and that was did I speak out of my State or did I not, and I decided not to go out of Missouri, and I didn't during the entire year.

Many of my colleagues and many other good Democrats came in to help me. Therefore when I am asked to go around and help the Democratic Party at fund raising dinners and others, why I do.

Now specifically answering your question, I am not actively seeking delegates at this time. I am interested in the general subject.

Mr. CHILDS. I would like to ask you about another unavowed candidate, if I may use that phrase. When we had Governor Brown on this program, he was asked about Senator LYNDON JOHNSON. He said he thought he would have a handicap in the North because of oil and gas and the integration issue.

I wonder if you would agree with that?

Senator SYMINGTON. I think that a man can only speak for his own State. In my State where Senator JOHNSON talked recently and met with the leaders, he had a great deal of support.

Mr. CHILDS. You believe he could carry Missouri?

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, he can certainly carry Missouri over any Republican.

Mr. CHILDS. Does this mean, Senator, that you don't think the North-South division in your party is important and you could nominate a southerner to run for President of the United States?

Senator SYMINGTON. I don't think there is a North-South division in my party. Only once has the South left the party since I have been reasonably active in politics. In that case President Truman still won the nomination and the election and I would hope that geography woudn't play too prominent a part or be a decisive matter in the choosing of a President. I would hope the way the world is today that the United States as a country will stay together and that we will pick the best man for the job regardless of where he lives. I think never more true was this statement of Benjamin Franklin's as we watch this situation, as I have noticed it over the world in recent weeks: "If we don't all hang together now we are going to hang separately."

Mr. CHILDS. Wasn't that Patrick Henry?

Senator SYMINGTON. I think it was Benjamin Franklin.

Mr. SPIVAK. You have said you are not a candidate for the presidential nomination. Would you tell us whether you would like to be President in 1960?

Senator SYMINGTON. I certainly would like to be President in 1960. I think anybody in politics would like to be President in 1960. It is going to be a rough job but the way things are going now I would hope we could put a brake and turn this country on the right keel from the standpoint of making us strong so that we can stay free.

Let me emphasize by strength I don't mean just physical strength, I mean all the other strengths.

I believe the one way that we can assure peace in the world is for the United States and its allies to get together and remain strong.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, I would like to ask you another question, which I hope you won't consider a too personal question, but your critics are saying that you are all things to all men and are able therefore to get equally strong support in groups in sharp controversy with each other: the segregationists and the anti-segregationists; labor and capital; conservatives and liberals. How do you answer that charge that has been made against you, and it has been made as a charge against you?

Senator SYMINGTON. First, Mr. Spivak, they don't say it to me and secondly, I know of no issue that I haven't voted on and taken a position on and I think the charge is totally unwarranted. My voting record I believe proves it and I naturally am sorry that people say it. There is no justification, no proof of any kind for it. I regret that some people have said it.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, Senator, do you think that it is necessarily bad for you to be endorsed by the ADA and to be a favorite of the Chamber of Commerce, for example? This is for example from Harpers: "He is at home with the ADA and is far from unwelcome at the same table at the luncheon of the Chamber of Commerce."

Another one from the New York Post: "He can also apparently persuade liberals that he is a chip off the New Deal block and conservatives that he is as solid as a Hoover dollar."

Senator SYMINGTON. One of the last things my father-in-law said to me before he died, and he was a great American as well as a great Senator, was that politics was not a science, it was an art. It was the art of getting along with people. I do my best to get along with as many people as I can. Never once has that changed my convictions on an issue.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Senator, recently two political people, Governor Rockefeller and Senator Kennedy, have made it clear that they simply wouldn't consider, have anything to do with the vice presidential nomination. I am not going to ask whether you would accept the vice presidential nomination because I think nearly everybody could know the answer.

What I want to ask you is, do you think that either party ought to nominate a vice presidential candidate who is not qualified to be the presidential nominee?

Senator SYMINGTON. I do not.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Do you think that there is much prospect that either party will do that?

Senator SYMINGTON. I would not, Mr. Drummond. Naturally as you know, the vice presidential decision is one that is generally made, you might say "at the last minute."

On the other hand I would hope that the Vice President of the United States next time is a man who is fully capable, the way the world is, of being a good President.

Mr. BROOKS. I think with that future in mind, Senator, I will have to call a halt to the proceedings. I am sorry to interrupt but I see that our time is up.

Thank you very much, Senator Symington, for being with us. We will be back with Meet the Press in just a moment. First this message.

The ANNOUNCER. Meet the Press brings you leading world figures at a time when what they say or do is important in the news.

Next week only, Meet the Press will be seen over many of these stations at one p.m. eastern standard time because of the pro ball game. Consult your local TV listings for exact time in your area. Our guest will be the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, the most controversial member of the Eisenhower Cabinet.

If you have enjoyed today's program, you may wish to receive a printed copy of the questions and answers. In just one minute, we will tell you how you may get your transcript.

For a printed copy of today's discussion send ten cents in coin and a stamped, self-addressed envelope to Merkle Press, 801 Rhode Island Avenue, Northeast, Washington 18, D.C.

And now goodby for Senator STUART SYMINGTON and Meet the Press.

Meet the Press was produced by Lawrence E. Spivak; directed by Frank Slingland; associate producer, Betty Cole; technical director, Leon Chromak; production supervisor, Doris Corwith.

This is Lee Dayton speaking.

Need for Revision of Status of Forces Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill requesting the President to revise existing treaties to preclude foreign countries from taking jurisdiction over members of our Armed Forces stationed overseas.

This is hardly a new proposal in the Congress. I personally have been urging this resolution since 1955. Two years later the Girard case came to public attention and there was renewed support for a revision of our policy.

This is now 1960. Our boys are still subject to foreign jurisdiction under treaties which have remained the same despite congressional protest.

I feel very strongly that it is time we renewed that protest. The Girard case, which pointed up the problem so dramatically, was hardly an isolated incident. The list of less-publicized examples continues.

I am requesting the Department of Defense to supply me with data on the number of our servicemen who are currently serving jail terms in foreign countries, and I shall make that data available as soon as I receive it.

The reasons for my resolution have been too often described for me to discuss them in detail at this time. It remains basically unfair, regardless of constitutionality, to draft our young men into military service and then unceremoni-

ously abandon them to the vagaries of foreign jurisdictions, which may or may not adhere to our concepts of justice and fairplay.

I was personally familiar with a case of a young serviceman from my district who, several years ago, narrowly escaped British execution on evidence which turned out to be not only flimsy, but inaccurate. As I said in a statement at that time, the fact that this could happen in a judicial system so much like ours suggests strongly what coud happen, and does happen, under systems which are far more dissimilar.

Perhaps the greatest problem which the serviceman who is tried in a foreign court must face is the hostile sentiment which often makes conviction inevitable. Further, this conviction, which may be based as much on the hostile temper of the court as on available evidence, is frequently the basis for discharging that man from the service under less than honorable conditions.

I feel very strongly that we cannot, in all conscience, permit this situation to continue.

I do not believe that these treaties, as is frequently alleged, are necessary to the conduct of our foreign policy. To the contrary, I feel that the passions which are periodically aroused, whenever a foreign court tries a serviceman accused of a serious crime, do far more to strain our normal relations with our allies than would result were these cases turned over as a routine matter to our own military authorities.

Again, I want to emphasize that, although the Girard case is a thing of the past, this issue is as pressing today as it was in 1957. I therefore urge that this matter be given the serious and immediate attention it deserves.

Putting in Your "2 Cents Worth"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and a pleasure for me to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House an article which appeared in the December 1959–January 1960 issue of Topics which was authored by our distinguished and beloved majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

It is a simple yet eloquent statement on a subject which is very close to all of us written by one of the most sincere and splendid Americans ever to sit in this Chamber. I am sure that you will find the following of great interest, and I am more than happy to be able to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Americans have a way of expressing their views in down-to-earth, simple terms, and one of these phrases is: "I put in my 2 cents worth."

Putting in our 2 cents worth, or expressing our individual opinions, can be vitally important to the future of our country.

Americans have a God-implanted love of free speech, but I have observed during my service in Congress that too few of our citizens take advantage of this privilege of speaking up on Government matters.

A reason may be that many people believe their Congressman does not welcome a letter or a telephone call from a citizen who has an opinion on some past, pending or future matter. May I correct this mistaken idea as simply and as clearly as possible? Every Congressman welcomes the opinion and counsel of our citizens because his primary job is to do just that: represent our people in the Government of our country. To do this well, the Congressman must know what his people are thinking, and the more opinions he gets the better will be his decisions. Public opinion is a very important factor in a democracy.

The very basis of our Government is built around people. What we call politics, elections, legislation—all are attuned to one great determinant, the voice of the people or public opinion.

The people created America, and the people—you and I—must continue to watch over and improve the country our forefathers built and our contemporaries are building. This is our duty and our greater obligation.

As a country, we decided long ago to place this responsibility upon our citizens. Freedom for all was the fruit of this decision, but freedom carries with it the cost of widespread citizen interest and participation in the affairs of Government.

One of the best ways to fulfill your duties of active citizenship, of course, is to help elect the man or women of your choice to public office. But do not stop there. Let me encourage you to take the next step. Keep the persons who represent you in Government informed of your views throughout the year. This is an equally important responsibility in our democratic form of government.

Sometimes I think it might be well if we erected a large sign over Congress which contained this thought: Here the opinions of all Americans are heard—and should be heard—with equality. As a result, the sense of their proposals becomes the law of the land.

Or perhaps we should put it in more typical American language: Here your 2 cents worth does make a difference.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Member of Congress.

National Safety Council and American Merchant Marine Institute Honors MSTS Crew of USNS "Pendleton"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I have sent to Admiral Gano, commander, Military Sea Transportation Service, commending his gallant crew on their great seamanship during the rescue of 24 Japanese fishermen who survived the sinking of their ship a year ago. I also include the names of the crewmen who reside in San Francisco and clippings detailing this great exploit in the annals of maritime history. I am now and always have been proud of our MSTS service and their brave officers and seamen. May I commend to your attention these items:

Vice Adm. ROY A. GANO,
U.S. Navy, Commander Military Sea Transportation Service, Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ROY: With the presentation of the National Safety Council and American Merchant Marine Institute Special Award of Merit to the skipper and crew of the USNS *Pendleton*, national attention has once again been drawn to the magnificent seamanship of the men under your command.

The rescue of all 24 of the Japanese fishermen who survived the sinking of their sampan *Chiyo Maru* a year ago December has already become a legend of the sea. It is rightly fitting that the National Safety Council and the American Merchant Marine Institute should single out Capt. Hans C. von Weien and his brave and skillful crew for this honor.

I wish I had been back in my hometown of San Francisco when the award was presented and been able to have taken part in honoring the splendid seamen whose courage and devotion to duty exemplify the highest standards of seamanship which are characteristic of the Military Sea Transportation Service.

JOHN F. SHELLEY,
Member of Congress.

CREW MEMBERS ON BOARD USNS "PENDLETON" ON DECEMBER 18, 1958

PRESENT ASSIGNMENT

Name and address

Fred S. Crowley, Jr., radio officer, 49½ Caselli Avenue, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Modesto L. Lauriano, Carpenter, 639 Excelsior Avenue, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Enicirio A., Adam, able seaman, 5 Porter Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Archie F. Moromisato, ordinary seaman, 1990 Sutter Street, San Francisco; RIF January 1, 1960.

Chee T. Wong, ordinary seamen, 2248 Mason Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Hom B. Pon, ordinary seaman, 728 Montgomery Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Murray W. Jewett, first assistant engineer, 903 Pine Street, San Francisco; receiving section.[1]

Hugh I. Morrison, third assistant engineer, 121 Yukon Street, San Francisco; receiving section.[1]

Shee H. Yip, fourth assistant engineer, 1170 Powell Street, San Francisco; *Miller.*

Wayne F. Wagner, licensed junior engineer, 938 Geary Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Gasper F. Ferro, oiler, 576 Geary Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Carroll L. Main, oiler, 1955 Quesada Avenue, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Donald Chew, oiler, 1464 Leavenworth Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Aurelio Ducosin, fireman-watertender, 654 Capp Street, San Francisco; receiving section.[1]

Damian A. Aguilar, fireman-watertender, 1351 Stockton Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Cornelio M. Manay, wiper, 1503 Scott Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Salvador P. Gancero, wiper, 281 Santos Street, San Francisco; *Patrick.*

Water L. Reed, second cook-baker, 235 Prague Street, San Francisco; *Patrick.*

Cornelio Villafuerte, assistant cook, 350 South Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco; retired May 31, 1959.

Rofino C. Forges, messman, 935 Kearny Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Cleto J. Mercado, messman, Post Office Box 1028, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

[1] Awaiting reassignment.

Donato H. Visico, utility, 1478 Hudson Avenue, San Francisco; *Breton.*

Henry C. Verano, utilityman, Post Office Box 7073, San Francisco; *Patrick.*

Manuel G. Carreon, utilityman, 234 Linden Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

George, Cowans, utilityman, 1084 McAllister Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

ADRIFT 29 HOURS—"PENDLETON" RESCUES 24 JAP FISHERMEN

In June 1944, the *Mandan Victory* slid down the ways to join the fleet of supply ships which helped win the war in the Pacific. Later, renamed the *Sgt. Jack J. Pendleton,* she worked for the old Army Transportation Corps, and in January 1950, she joined MSTS. Little of excitement or special note happened to her from then until last December when she picked up this message from Pac:

"Fishing boat *Chiyoh Maru,* 148 tons, 25 crew, large hole in hull, flooding seriously. S O S received. Position 17–48 N., 161–25 E. Divert to position. Render assistance as necessary."

The U.S.N.S. *Pendleton* acknowledged the message and altered course while her crew made preparations for picking up survivors. Next word from the *Pendleton* came 28 hours later when her new skipper, Capt. Hans C. Von Weien, sent this message:

"* * * picked up entire crew *Chiyoh Maru.* Twenty-four members all aboard at 18130Z. No apparent injuries. Men taken from makeshift raft. * * *"

With the 24 fishermen safely aboard, the U.S.N.S. *Pendleton* set course for Guam. Their raft, which was left adrift, was described by Captain Von Weien. It consisted, he said, of four oil drums, various wooden boxes and fishing balls, held together by a fish net. It provided standing room only and rode the waves in sections. Once aboard the *Pendleton,* the Japanese, who had been adrift for 29 hours, luxuriated in fresh-water showers and were given cigarettes and $5 apiece by the crew.

At Guam the *Pendleton* and her crew received heroes' welcome, including a Navy band at dockside and a 25-foot banner hailing the rescue.

Captain Von Weien and his crew received official accolades from COMSTS, Admiral Will; from commander in chief, Pacific Fleet; and from commander, Hawaiian Sea Frontier—all of whom sent dispatches—while Rear Adm. W. L. Erdmann, commander, naval forces, Marianas, waited at the dock in Guam to greet them.

U.S. SHIP RESCUES JAPAN CREW ADRIFT

YOKOHAMA (KYODO).—All 24 crew members of a Japanese tuna boat, which sent out an S O S Wednesday southwest of Wake Island, were rescued Thursday by a U.S. military transport.

News of their rescue was contained in a report received yesterday by local maritime safety authorities from Wake Island.

The report said the 148-ton *Chiyo Maru* of Misaki, Kanagawa Prefecture, had been abandoned after it sprung a leak.

Skipper Kazuyoshi Taniguchi and the crewmen took to a raft and were picked up about 500 kilometers (300 miles) southwest of Wake at about 10:40 p.m., Thursday by the U.S. military transport *Jack Pendleton.*

The rescued fishermen were reported to be heading for Guam aboard the American transport, one of a number of U.S. and Japanese ships which rushed to the aid of the sinking boat. Planes also took part in the search for the craft.

MSTS SHIP RESCUES 24 FISHERMEN

YOKOSUKA, JAPAN.—The U.S. Navy said Friday a Military Sea Transportation Service cargo ship rescued 24 survivors from a stricken Japanese fishing boat at midnight Thursday about 1,800 miles southeast of Japan.

The MSTS ship *Sgt. Jack P. Pendleton,* a modified attack cargo ship, rushed to assist the fishing boat *Chiyoh-Maru* Wednesday after the Japanese vessel reported it had a hole in its hull and was flooding.

A Navy spokesman said word was received from the rescue ship that all members of the fishing boat's crew were rescued, including the Japanese skipper.

The Navy spokesman said the brief rescue message reported the Japanese vessel had sunk but did not elaborate on how the survivors managed to stay afloat.

The message quoted the Japanese captain as saying all persons aboard had been saved and that the boat was lost.

MSTS TO RESCUE—JAPANESE CREW SAVED

GUAM.—Twenty-four crewmen of an ill-fated Japanese fishing boat rescued Thursday by an American cargo vessel were transferred at sea Sunday off Guam to another fishing boat for return to Japan.

The Japanese fishermen had drifted 29 hours on an open raft with standing room only after sending an S O S Wednesday that their ship, the *Chiyoh Maru,* was sinking.

They were picked up by the U.S. Military Sea Transport Service cargo ship *Sgt. Jack J. Pendleton.* The *Pendleton* rendezvoused with the *Sazamu Maru,* a sister ship of the *Chiyoh Maru,* 3 miles off Apra Harbor, Guam.

The Japanese were transferred by Navy crash boat.

Vice Adm. John M. Will, commander of the MSTS in Washington, described the rescue as upholding the finest traditions at sea.

Capt. Hans C. von Weien, the *Pendleton's* master, had high praise for the Japanese survivors.

He said they had been adrift on a makeshift 8-by-10-foot raft assembled from four oil drums, wooden boxes and fishing float balls held together by fishing net.

The survivors said the raft rode the waves in sections.

The Japanese fishermen took long and vigorous showers aboard the *Pendleton* and were treated to haircuts by the ship's barber. The crew furnished them with clothing and rubber sandals.

Just before their transfer the Japanese were given $5 and a carton of cigarettes each as a farewell gift.

The *Pendleton* received a hero's welcome when it returned to Guam after the transfer. Rear Adm. W. L. Erdmann, commander, Naval Forces Mariannas, and the Navy band were on hand to greet the rescuers.

[From the Japan Times, Dec. 22, 1958]

CREW RESCUED BY U.S. VESSEL BOARDS JAPAN SHIP OFF GUAM

YOKOSUKA.—Twenty-four Japanese fishermen rescued from a makeshift raft in mid-Pacific by an American naval craft, were transferred Sunday to a Japanese fishing boat off Guam, the U.S. Navy reported.

The survivors, who were aboard the *Chiyo Maru* which sank Wednesday night 350 miles west southwest of Wake Island, were transferred from the attack ship *Sgt. Jack J. Pendleton* to the *No. 7 Sasayama Maru* 3 miles off Apra Harbor at 8:30 a.m. Sunday, the Navy said.

The *Sasayama Maru* was one of two Japanese fishing boats directed by Japan's Maritime Safety Agency to pick up the survivors at a rendezvous point off Guam. The *No. 3 Azuma Maru* was also reported heading for the same place.

The *Pendleton,* a U.S. Navy attack cargo ship was en route to San Francisco from Guam when it received an S O S call Wednesday night. She diverted her course and picked up the fishermen some 1,000 miles northeast of Guam Thursday night.

The survivors were found adrift aboard a makeshift raft that consisted of four oil drums, various wooden boxes and fishing glass balls securely enclosed in a fishing net, the Navy said. They were adrift for 29 hours.

The *Chiyo Maru,* a 1,481-ton tuna fishing boat, flashed a distress signal at 5:50 p.m. Wednesday and sank 55 minutes later.

Anti-Semitic Vandalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the wave of anti-Semitism which has swept over Germany in recent weeks is most deplorable. Perhaps the most unfortunate thing is its spread to various lands in Europe, the Americas and elsewhere, where irresponsible young people and lunatic fringe followers are defacing synagogues, churches, institutions and private homes with swastikas and other symbols of hatred.

These anti-Jewish and antireligious demonstrations have occurred in various places and communities in this country and abroad where this form of social virulence has never before been a serious factor. I have no way of knowing whether these demonstrations have been organized by certain rightist or leftist elements for political or other purposes. I have no way of knowing whether they are being financed by certain elements in Communist or Arab countries, or by Nazi remnants still operating abroad, as is being suspected by many people.

One thing I do know, and that is: The free world, America included, has been dealt a heavy blow in the eyes of upright, liberty-loving and peace-loving people everywhere. In the midst of a great ideological struggle, when the nations of the free world are actually fighting for freedom and survival, our attention is diverted to acts of prejudice and intolerance which only tend to divide our forces and to sap our strength. The smearing of swastikas on houses of worship is not the path to survival in the struggle against communism, as some blind fanatics and cranks may believe, but is the road to ruin and destruction of our civilization, our common heritage and our very freedom.

Attacks on houses of worship are direct attacks upon freedom itself. Those who hate one religion, hate all religions. They also hate everyone whose beliefs may differ from theirs, whose national origin may be different, whose color of skin is different, whose political or social views are different. They prefer totalitarianism of one kind or another, based on hatred against all those who disagree with them. We fought World War II to eradicate this dangerous concept which brought so much misery upon humanity and resulted in the death of millions of innocent people.

Now, we are witnessing a resurgence of these evil forces. If left to pursue their

evil deeds, we shall sooner or later be faced with a new world tragedy. This is a warning which should not be ignored. There is no room in American life for these demented fanatics who let themselves become tools of others who seek to destroy us. Similarly, there should be no room for them in Germany if the German people and their leaders are earnestly interested in casting their lot with the free world.

We should make it clear to the German people that we expect them to adopt the strongest measures to eradicate these fanatics. We should also make it clear to them that if there is a revival or resurgence of nazism there, they should understand that the free world, America included, will be forced to renounce its alliance and support of a German state which tolerates or encourages neo-nazism in any form. At the same time, let us give the German people every assurance of support if they show a genuine desire and effort to uproot anti-Semitism and those preaching bigotry and intolerance.

Let's Help the Small Tobacco Farmer: Statements of Representative Ken Hechler and Senator Randolph Emphasize West Virginia Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there are some 4,500 farmers in West Virginia who harvested tobacco in 1958. The growers in our State produce on a small scale.

My colleague from the Fourth District, Representative KEN HECHLER, has most of these farmers in the area he serves—and serves so well.

It is my privilege, Mr. President, to ask permission to have printed a recent statement by Representative HECHLER before the meeting within the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Tobacco Division, to discuss the outlook for supply and demand of burley tobacco.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S HELP THE SMALL TOBACCO FARMER

(Remarks of Hon. KEN HECHLER, Democrat, of West Virginia, before the Tobacco Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture, January 14, 1960)

Gentlemen, when I appeared before you last year, I urged the Tobacco Division to resist attempts to reduce quotas in burley tobacco which would have reduced further the small incomes earned by many of the Nation's small tobacco farmers.

I was delighted that the Department of Agriculture did indeed resist this unwise and unwarranted pressure and retained tobacco allotments for the 1959 crop year at their 1958 levels.

The visible proof that your decision was a wise one is contained in the projected figures for the 1959–60 marketing year, which show that total supply—instead of increasing disastrously, as some feared—actually has declined in the past year from about 1,750 million pounds to an estimated 1,735 million pounds. I also understand that disappearance will show an increase this year which, based on a reasonable projection of existing market trends, may be in the neighborhood of 12 million pounds, or from 515 million pounds in 1958–59 to possibly 526 to 528 million in 1959–60.

This is ample evidence to me that tobacco, under the wise guidance of your Division and the cooperative spirit of the growers, remains our most intelligently marketed crop.

I believe both the farmers and the policymakers in the Tobacco Division deserve the commendation of all citizens.

Now I would like to speak for a moment on the 1960 crop year and the manner in which it relates to my district, which lies in the Ohio Valley and embraces the major tobacco-growing area of the State of West Virginia. In fact, 4,191 of the 4,565 tobacco allotments in West Virginia—or more than 91 percent, are in the Fourth District, which borders the Ohio River.

These 4,565 farmers in West Virginia harvested only 2,211 acres of tobacco in 1958. The small size of the average quota is obvious—it amounts to only forty-eight one hundredths of an acre. All West Virginia growers are raising tobacco on a very small scale.

I would like to bring you up to date on a few additional facts about the State of West Virginia.

The State's unemployment continues high, and the rate of unemployment is the highest in the Nation. Nearly one out of seven members of the work force is unemployed. And there is no relief in sight for the depressed condition of the State's economy.

Many of the quota-holders in West Virginia have, in the past, held part-time or full-time jobs, with the income from their farms supplementing these earnings. Today, many of these farmers have lost outside employment. There simply are no jobs to be had, and they are attempting to subsist entirely on the pitifully small income from tobacco farming.

For many of these farmers, the cash income from tobacco often provides the only dollars they see during an entire year. It is their only cash crop. Therefore, I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of this crop to these small landholders. It frequently marks the difference between proud, self-sufficient living and the dependence upon public assistance funds to keep body and soul together.

The economic situation in West Virginia has improved only slightly since I reported to you in January 1959. Therefore, it is still just as urgent that the small farmer be given every reasonable protection under the law.

I would also like to suggest that some consideration be given to trying to increase quotas for small tobacco farmers in areas which the Department of Labor rules as "chronically depressed areas," with persistently high rates of unemployment.

Last year I was happy to support a tobacco bill which retained the principle of quotas and marketing supports but corrected a flaw which has developed in the modernized parity formula. This was a step to preserve and protect our export markets for tobacco, and I voted for it because I knew that tobacco farmers all over the Nation—in the spirit of cooperation and responsible citizenship which has characterized their statesmanlike attitude to the tobacco problem for many years—would be behind me in this fight.

Unfortunately, this bill, like many other good measures in 1959, met with a poorly explained and unjustified Presidential veto. Now I have been advised that a compromise measure has been evolved and again will be offered to the Congress. It is my hope that an effective and workable tobacco bill can be enacted into law this year.

Legislation is not the only item on the tobacco horizon at this time. I have been advised that there is a move under way to request a general raising of tobacco allotments for the 1960 growing season.

It seems to me that the matter of increasing tobacco quotas must be approached with greatest caution. This should not become a political football for profitable kicking around during an election year—with the tobacco farmer left to reap the horrible consequences after November 8.

The tobacco farmer does not want to sell his long-range, effective program down the river for a few short-range benefits, and I recommend that any decisions, to alter the allotment structure in any way be made with this thought firmly in mind.

But I believe that the time has come to raise quotas for those small tobacco farmers now growing less than six-tenths of an acre. There is ample authority for such preferred and just treatment under the law. The Secretary of Agriculture is specifically granted such authority, in fact.

May I cite section 313(c) of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which provides:

"The Secretary shall provide * * * for the allotment not in excess of the national marketing quota * * * for further increase of allotments to small farmers."

I hope that under the terms of this section of the law which governs tobacco growing and marketing that the Division could provide some relief for the struggling small farmer. I further respectfully submit that such a formula could be instrumented without creating undue hardship upon the larger farmer and without exceeding the provisions of section 313(c).

May I propose for your consideration the following program:

For each farmer presently assigned an allotment of less than 0.2 of 1 acre, an increase of a flat 0.2 additional acreage shall be granted.

For farmers now growing from 0.21 to 0.3 of an acre, a sliding scale of increases not less than 0.15 acre but not in excess of 0.2 acre shall be granted.

For farmers with allotments from 0.31 to 0.4, an increase not less than 0.1 and not in excess of 15 shall be granted, again on a sliding scale dependent on previous acreage.

For farmers with allotments from 0.41 to 5 acres, an increase not less than 0.05 acre and not in excess of 0.1 shall be granted on the same sliding scale.

For all farmers with allotments of more than 0.5 acre, a flat increase of 10 percent of the 1959 allotment.

This would be a workable plan, within the framework of a 10 percent increase which I understand may be under active consideration within the Division.

This would be an altogether reasonable formula which would not deny deserved increases to the larger farmer, would not upset the marketing and support program, and would provide benefits where they are most needed.

In addition, it would not even require the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the full 5 percent benefit provision contained in section 313(c).

Under my formula, slightly less than 3.5 percent of the total national marketing quota would be set aside to benefit the small farmer.

If a 10 percent increase should be feasible, this would mean that the present marketing quota of about 310,000 would rise to about 341,000 acres.

Now, if the Secretary should choose to utilize only seven-tenths of the 5 percent "increase of allotments to small farms" provided under the law, this 3.5 percent increase would provide for the distribution of an additional 11,935 acres in increased allotments.

Sharing in this increase would be 25,000 farmers across the Nation who now hold allotments of 0.2 acre or less. A flat 0.2 increase would add 5,000 acres to their present production of only 3,095 acres.

The 13,700 farmers now raising from 0.21 to 0.3 acre could add 2,408 acres to their present production total of 3,425, under the formula I have outlined here. The 14,100 farmers now raising 4,935 acres would increase their production by 1,763 acres. This is the number of farmers with allotments ranging from 0.31 to 0.4 acre.

The 27,900 farmers with 0.41 to 0.5 acre would add 2,093 acres to the 12,555 acres they now grow.

And how much would this increase the national marketing quota?

I am happy to say that it would amount to a total increase of 11,264 acres—less than 600 acres of the 11,935 acres which would be provided for the small farmer if the Secretary will use the authorization of section 313(c) to increase allotments for small farmers not 5, but only 3.5 percent.

I firmly am convinced that in this way allotment increases could be apportioned among farmers who need them most. Every dollar added to their income would go toward providing a more stable way of life for them—and coincidentally would be pumped immediately back into the Nation's economy as the purchasing power of these deserving farmers increases.

This would be a humanitarian approach to the problem, and would render the maximum good for the largest number of people.

This, I believe, should be the underlying motive and governing factor if it is deemed possible to increase 1960 quotas.

The tobacco farmer wants these increases, if they can be granted without damaging the program which has proved the most successful and effective of an otherwise dismal farm administration.

They want to increase production and earn more dollars, but they do not want to return to the roller-coaster days of tobacco marketing, when a year of boom was followed by several of inevitable bust. The present program was an outgrowth of the problems raised by this damaging cycle, and the tobacco farmer is determined that it shall never return again.

The tobacco farmers of West Virginia have shown their patriotism by their record. They have stood with other farmers in defending and protecting their program even when it meant drastic reduction of their allotments in the face of falling markets a few years ago.

Consequently, the tobacco industry today is sound. Export markets apparently are weathering a serious storm and have risen about 30 percent over 1958. Disappearance is increasing and we all hope that its steady upward curve will continue.

It is most heartening that an increase appears to be justified this year or in the near future. For this I am truly thankful.

We must, at all costs, preserve the tobacco program which has been proven so effective.

If it does prove feasible to raise quotas for 1960, we should consider it only a matter of simple justice to distribute the major portion of this increase among the small allotment holders who depend so strongly upon tobacco to provide them with life's necessities.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask further consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD correspondence between Director Joe R. Williams and myself in reference to the subject of Representative HECHLER's address.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE,
TOBACCO DIVISION,
Washington, D.C. December 18, 1959.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: A meeting will be held at 9:15 a.m., e.s.t., on Thursday, January 14, 1960, in the Jefferson Auditorium, South Building, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., to discuss the supply and demand outlook for burley tobacco and to obtain views and recommendations on the amount of the 1960 national marketing quota.

We shall be pleased to have any comments which you may wish to give us either by letter or telephone or to have you attend the meeting.

Sincerely yours,
JOE R. WILLIAMS, *Director.*

BURLEY TOBACCO SUPPLY AND DEMAND SITUATION

The carryover of burley tobacco on October 1, 1959, beginning of the current marketing year, totaled 1,236 million pounds, farm sales weight basis. This represented a decrease of about 50 million pounds, or about 4 percent, from a year earlier.

The 1959 crop of burley tobacco was estimated as of December 1, 1959, to be 500 million pounds, about 35 million pounds, or 7 percent, larger than the 1958 crop.

The total supply of burley tobacco (i.e., carryover plus estimated production) for the current marketing year is 1,736 million pounds, down 15 million pounds from a year ago. For the fifth successive year, the total supply has declined. The total reduction from the 1954–55 peak supply of 1,866 million pounds has been 130 million pounds, or 7 percent. At the current level of disappearance, the present supply is sufficient for a duration of about 3.4 years, while a supply of about 2.8 years' duration is considered normal under the formula contained in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Domestic consumption of burley tobacco during the marketing year ending September 30, 1959, was 480 million pounds, a gain of about 6 million pounds, or 1½ percent, over the previous year.

Exports of burley tobacco during the marketing year ending September 30, 1959, totaled about 35 million pounds, farm weight. This was a gain of about 7 million pounds from the level of the past 2 years, but about the same as during the 1955–56 marketing year. For the calendar year 1959, burley exports are running about 1 percent below the same period of last year.

It is estimated that cigarette production during the calendar year 1959 will reach an alltime high of about 488 billion, or 3.8 percent more than in 1958 and 12 percent more than the previous high of 1952. The quantity of domestic tobacco utilized in cigarettes has gained little in the last few years despite this substantial increase in the number of cigarettes manufactured.

It is estimated that the production of smoking tobacco during the calendar year 1959 will total about 73 million pounds, about 3 million pounds, or nearly 4 percent, less than in 1958. The production of chewing tobacco in 1959 is expected to be about 1½ million pounds, or 2 percent, less than in 1958.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
TOBACCO DIVISION, CSS.
DECEMBER 1959.

JANUARY 13, 1960.

Mr. JOE R. WILLIAMS,
Director, Tobacco Division, Community Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: Thanks very much for your letter and the enclosed analysis of the tobacco supply and demand situation. The comprehensive statistics included are informative and helpful.

To my regret, previous commitments will prevent my attendance at your meeting but I appreciate the opportunity to express my views concerning the tobacco program for 1960.

I wish to commend the Tobacco Division of the Commodity Stabilization Service for maintaining stable growing and marketing conditions in the tobacco industry during the past year. I shall hope that this stability can be maintained throughout 1960. In allocating quotas for the present year, it is my opinion that special consideration should be given to the small tobacco farmer whose allotment is less than half an acre, and I respectfully urge your Division to take this action. There is ample authority for such action under section 313(c) of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1949, as amended.

There are thousands of small tobacco farmers in our State of West Virginia whose average allotment is only 0.48 of an acre. Many of them depend on tobacco as their only cash crop and an acreage increase would be of genuine assistance to them. This adjustment would be particularly important because of the areas of unemployment in our State which significantly affect its economy.

I would not, however, advocate any increase which would impair the tobacco program administered by your Division. If it is feasible to grant increases for this year, I strongly recommend that they be distributed to the small farmer, including the constituents which I am privileged to represent.

With kind regards and best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

An Eastern Big City Congressman Looks at Resource Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on January 19 I had the privilege of speaking before the Electric Consumers Information Committee at the Hotel Willard in Washington, D.C. I am thankful to Jack Curran, a member of the ECIC executive committee, who extended to me an invitation to participate in a luncheon session of a legislative workshop with people from all over the United States who are interested in the problem of power and our natural resources. Mr. John Edelman, legislative representative of the Textile Workers, was the chairman.

The subject of my talk was "An Eastern Big City Congressman Looks at Resource Development." In view of the erroneous impression that a conflict exists between the interests of the farm people and the city dwellers, I believe that my talk might eliminate some of the erroneous impressions held by many people.

I found the question and answer period after the speech very stimulating and the comments reaffirmed my deep-rooted feeling that whether we live on the farms or dwell in the cities that we are Americans all and that our natural resources have been granted to us for the benefit of all mankind, and not for the aggrandizement of power by a monolithic state or for the financial benefit of a select few.

The text of my speech follows:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN ALFRED E. SANTANGELO BEFORE ELECTRIC CONSUMERS INFORMATION COMMITTEE, TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1960

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ellis, Jack Curran, members of the Electric Consumers Information Committee, and ladies and gentlemen, I have been asked today to speak to you on the subject of how "An Eastern, Big City Congressman Looks at Resource Development." I am happy to participate in this workshop program.

When one talks about resource development, a person, whether he comes from the city, such as I, or from the farm belt, one immediately thinks of natural resources, farms, forests, fish and wildlife, minerals and sources of energy. Some city dwellers think of hunting, fishing, and swimming. The thought that comes to me, and which is sometimes overlooked, is the world's greatest natural resource—its population. This is so whether it be where population is exploding or where it is controlled by natural or artificial means. When I talked of natural resources, I mean both groups—the animate and the inanimate and the relationship between them.

As a human being and as a Catholic, I believe in the dignity of the individual and in his inherent worth. Just as I believe governments are created for the protection of the individual and the development of a spiritual, economic and political being, so do I believe that our natural resources have been placed on earth for the benefit of all peoples, all human beings, and not for the aggrandizement of power of a state or the financial benefit of a select few.

I am not a hedonist who believes that pleasure is the primary objective of life or summum bonum, but sometimes when we attend congressional parties, labor luncheons, or house parties, one can validly draw the inference that the guests believe in the mammalian philosophy—live for today for there is no tomorrow.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, I have been compelled to think about the soil, the trees, our streams, electric power, and their use, their development and their preservation. I have been extremely interested in these resources because I know that they affect my life, my constituency, and my Nation.

We all know that no nation is any stronger than its resources permit it to be. Because America has been fortunate in the blessings of nature bestowed upon it in the shape of all varieties of natural resources we have become strong. We have attained our preeminent position in the world today because we have had the energy, the ingenuity, and the purpose with which to convert natural resources in their many aspects to useful products. In the process, we have been shamefully prodigal as well as admirably efficient. Some nations have not been blessed with nature's bounty and consequently look to us with pitiful glances for help or with green eyes in envy.

Of all the natural resources needed to support even so complex an industrial structure and sophisticated a society as ours is today, there are only a very few which we do not possess in some quantity. Those few which we may need we have, of course, been able to secure elsewhere by exchange for others of which we have a surplus or for products made from them. And so we have our exports and imports and our trade agreements.

The first of the natural resources we come to is water. Certain elementary facts must be recognized. Water is vital to every form of life. We have a fixed or finite quantity of water in this world. Some have too much for their needs, such as Siam, Panama, and other countries in the Far East, which I have had the extreme pleasure of visiting within the past several months. Other areas have too little, such as Hong Kong, where running water is used only for several hours a day, or in parts of southern Italy, which suffers from the lack of water. Certain areas which have sufficient for their needs, do not have it at the time when they need it. So for them, it is a problem of storage and use in time of need. Then it becomes a matter of distribution. We have seen such conservation in the Tennessee Valley, in the far West at the Columbia River, or at the Wilson Dam.

I understand that Russia is developing the largest water dam in the world which will provide electric power and irrigation. This damsite is located at Bratsk north of Lake Baikal on the Angara River, and when completed will be more than 40 times as large as our largest reservoir at Hoover Dam. We almost had a war because the present administration withdrew its support to Egypt in the building of the Aswan Dam. I was pleased to see that Formosa with the help of our Government is building the first multipurpose water resources development undertaken by the Republic of China as part of an overall program to make Chiang Kai-shek's country self-sufficient. Its purposes are irrigation power, flood control, and public water supply.

Some areas have sufficient for their needs, but people in the use of it pollute, contaminate, or waste it, so that others cannot use it sufficiently or profitably. Riding across the 14th Street Bridge in Washington over the Potomac River, you will see this river being contaminated by industrial useage and those who live downstream are denied a proper use.

Water serves mankind in many ways. It helps provide food from the soil or from gravel as I saw in the hydroponic systems in Japan. It turns the turbines which furnish hydroelectric power and provides cheap electricity, as in the hills of Puerto Rico where the Rural Electrification Administration has brought light to darkness and bearable living conditions to the denizens of the hills.

When I first came to Congress I did not know what the words "Rural Electrification Administration" meant, and I had no conception of the kind of work it was accomplishing or the scope of its activities. The first real understanding I had of the REA's accomplishments was during my visit to Puerto Rico where I met Clyde Ellis and participated in a week's seminar conducted by the Puerto Rican Water Resources Authority. I traveled into the hills and inspected the powerplants and saw with my own eyes the wires leading to the shacks and hovels which some of the Puerto Ricans call their homes. In some instances the cost of the installation of the electricity was greater than the value of these homes. More than 50,000 families enjoyed for the first time the use of electricity and the darkness of the hills was illuminated. Refrigeration, preservation of food, electrical appliances, and modern conveniences were theirs for the asking by reason of the inspiration of a far-sighted Governor, Muñoz-Marín. Without the REA loans at 2-percent interest, these people would have remained in darkness, relegated to misery. Their health and their way of life were greatly improved.

Today we see an administration seeking to raise the interest rates to be paid by the REA from 2 percent to the going rate of interest paid by Government bonds. This means that the rate of interest would reach 5 percent and higher. This means that backward areas could not avail themselves of the great opportunities afforded by a program initiated under Franklin Delano Roosevelt which has brought electricity to 98 percent of the farm families throughout the United States and telephones to 90 percent of the people on the farms.

I, for one, will oppose a program which will grant 3½ percent additional interest to financial institutions to the detriment of the people and the destruction of one of the greatest programs our country has ever adopted.

Water serves as drink for man or beast, either in its pure state as H_2O or in its mixed state as in hooch. It also has less utilitarian purposes, such as perhaps for sartorial perfection as in washing and bathing or as a locus near the sands, attracting either a sunburn or the opposite sex.

As dependent as we are upon water then, we must learn to keep our demands within the available gallonage which is not infinite. As we approach the absolute limits we must learn to utilize it in the most efficient manner possible.

Wherever possible it must be used over and over. The same water that generates hydroelectric power can be used again. None is lost in the process. Wherever possible arid lands lying waste and unproductive should be given an opportunity to produce food and other products of the land. This will become more and more necessary as our population continues to grow.

Since the finite limits of water are known, at least in approximation, it is up to someone to take the lead in seeing that the available supply is most efficiently utilized. That someone could very well be the Federal Government. By that I do not necessarily mean that every drop should be nationalized and every bucketfull be doled out by a more or less benevolent Federal Government upon sufficient justification by potential consumers or users. I do mean that it would probably be a good thing that the utmost protection be given to the Nation's watersheds, that soil erosion be eliminated insofar as possible, that water pollution be prevented, or corrected when it occurs unavoidably.

I mean that potential hydroelectric power sites should be determined and the right to develop them be in the hands of those who can do so at the least cost, most efficiently and for the benefit of the most people. If these potential power sites are located where no one can or wants to undertake the job the Federal Government might undertake them. Not, however, unless there is at least a potential need for them.

As we well know, it would be a wasteful practice to build large power dams just for power. It is also possible to upset the natural regime of a stream and disorganize the economies of communities downstream dependent upon the water about to be impounded for domestic and industrial use, and possibly irrigation. The modern-day multiple-purpose planning for a coordinated development for all purposes is infinitely more desirable.

Yesterday our President forwarded to the Congress his budget message. In it he recommended $1,938,000 to be spent in fiscal year 1961 for natural resources, more than has been spent for this purpose in any previous year.

We have before Congress, apart from his recommendations, a measure which would establish a Council of Natural Resources and Conservation Advisers. The purpose of this council is to study the current status of

natural resource conservation and development and to develop, in terms of national policy for the President and the Congress, a program which will best meet the human, economic, and National defense requirements of the Nation and the enhancement of the National heritage for future generations.

A truly comprehensive program should encompass, each in its proper relationship to the other and to the whole program, all natural resources. These would include soil, water, timber, grazing land, fisheries, minerals, wildlife and, not to be neglected at all costs, recreational, scenic, and scientific values. The assistance and cooperation of all responsible parties should be enlisted. This I think should include industry, agriculture, government on all levels as well as individuals. Only thus could the interests of all citizens be given the proper consideration. That is the democratic way.

It would be well to have a central clearinghouse of information concerning the current status of our storehouse of nature's bounty. We should know of what plans there may be for its conservation, development, and utilization. If there are dangerous trends apparent, steps may be taken in time to arrest them. If there are forseen shortages developing, steps may be taken to head them off.

As a member of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, I am acutely aware of the accomplishments of the Rural Electrification Administration. I believe that some of my listeners may have some small interest in that program. That governmental undertaking is illustrative of the good that can be accomplished by the Government when others cannot or will not undertake the job.

Several other measures which protect our resources are such projects as the TVA, Bonneville Power Administration, marketing system, in the Pacific Northwest, other Federal power projects in various sections of the country and the rural electrification program. They have stimulated higher consumption of power at low wholesale rates. The results of this policy, which has its roots in the Reclamation Act amendments of 1906, have not only aided the ultimate power consumer in the regions affected, but have had an effect toward decreasing power rates in areas not in the watershed effected by the project even in large cities. (This is the F.D.R. yardstick of public power against which to measure rates of private utilities.) For example, the 1958 average annual domestic use of electricity in the TVA region was 7,800 kilowatt-hours, about double the national figure. The cost per kilowatt-hour of power among TVA distributors is about 60 percent of the average for the Nation. As a result the purchase of electrical appliances in the home and on the farm in the TVA is the highest in the Nation.

Since 1945 citizens of this region have purchased $2.5 billion worth of appliances and the same is true in the Pacific Northwest although adequate statistics are not available. Rural electric cooperatives, more than 900 in number throughout the country, form a $1 billion annual market for 20-odd household electrical appliances. These data were obtained from a study conducted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in 1959. It is obvious that low-cost power contributed to increasing usage which in turn contributed to purchase of more electrical appliances which help keep industries producing goods and workers employed.

From the standpoint of the national interest, I, as a big city Congressman, approve of the role that has been played during World War II, during the Korean crisis and by the TVA and Bonneville Power Administration in supplying power for defense during the present program of protecting the United States against aggression. Aluminum for the planes that helped to defeat the axis in World War II was produced by industries located in the TVA and on the Columbia. Only in those areas were there supplies of low-cost power available for the process of aluminum and other electro-process industries important to the war effort. As of now, more than half of TVA total power production goes to service the Atomic Energy Commission's facilities in that area. A substantial proportion of power generated by the Columbia River Basin dams is used to service the AEC facilities at Hanford, Wash.

The success of the programs that have been here described have stimulated areas elsewhere to look at their resources situation, particularly in the eastern part of the country where I live, in relation to meeting the problems of water pollution abatement, water supply navigation, and other uses of rivers.

The League of Women Voters, which enjoys respectability in the East, and perhaps is in disfavor in Louisiana, has set up as its goal the conservation of natural resources and the elimination of pollution. Whatever success they might achieve, of one thing you can be sure—that with such support, we will find this topic kept alive and legislators informed of its need and its importance.

I, for one, have supported the rural electrification program with vigor because I see its benefits and I recognize that all in our country, whether it be on the farm or in the city, have common interests. I have supported with pleasure the expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority's jurisdiction because I believe that the people of that area are entitled to cheap power and a right to receive the benefits which hydroelectric power provides for the residents in the area. If we in the city support programs which farmers feel are their private domain, we do so because we recognize their intimate relationship with us. We, on the other hand, have high hopes and confidence that the farmer be aware of and sympathetic to the problems which we cliffdwellers face in our urban centers. Newspaper reporters call this mutual assistance—"I scratch your back; you scratch my back theory of politics."

Our problems in the city are legion. We desperately need decent housing, and we would like to enjoy the fresh air which the farmers receive in their daily lives. We clamor for minimum wages because we feel that we should have the wherewithal to purchase the necessities of life and obtain those foods which we cannot abstract from the soil. If we recognize that we are our brothers' keepers and that there is no class warfare between the farmer and the city dweller, if we appreciate that education is the common concern of all, that decent housing, good health, are rights of mankind, then we have recognized the truth which has come down from all religions. When we recognize that truth, that Nature's bounty were planned for the benefit of mankind, then we can live as human beings and be proud of our way of life.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 1960

The Very Reverend Omelan Mitzik, rector, St. Mary's Ukrainian Orthodox Church, Chester, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ the Prince of Peace, we heartily thank Thee for the precious heritage of the life we share and love in this land.

We humbly beseech Thee so to guide and bless the President of the United States, the Senate here assembled, and all others in authority, that justice and truth, peace and freedom, may be established among us and all people.

We thank Thee, O Lord, for the Presidential proclamation of the "Captive Nations Week," enacted by you the U.S. Congress, which ever reminds both the free and the enslaved that our Nation is ever the champion of the persecuted and oppressed.

We pray and humbly beseech Thee to grant unto the people of Ukraine that they may soon regain their liberties of old, and once again unfurl their flags, and fly them gloriously in freedom and liberation from the yoke of enslavement.

Let Thy spirit enter into our hearts and minds to inspire us to rededicate ourselves anew on this January day to the glorious cause of justice, freedom, and peace for all people. Cheer with hope all distressed peoples. Grant health and strength to our leaders. Help us to labor abundantly for freedom and peace. In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 20, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 1282) relating to acreage allotments for Durum wheat.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CRASHES IN THE AIR—DEATH OF SON AND DAUGHTER-IN-LAW OF SENATOR CAPEHART

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, stark tragedy again has hit the family of one of the Members of the Senate. Early